

# ANNUAL REPORT

1969

housing authority city of newark

**HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK**

57 Sussex Avenue, Newark, New Jersey 07102

**BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS**

**THE REV. THOMAS J. FINNEGAN, CHAIRMAN**

**THEODORE P. PETTIGREW**

Vice Chairman

**RAYMOND P. STABILE**

Treasurer

**WILLIAM F. PURCELL SR.**

**DR. JACK G. SIEGEL**

**IRVING ROSENBERG**

**JOSEPH D. SIVOLELLA**

Executive Director

**Prepared by the Department of Research, Information and Statistics**

**ALEKSANDER SHLAHET**

Research Supervisor

**SHEILA CHASEN**

Research Analyst

**DEAN McELDOWNEY**

Research Analyst

**CAMILLE GUTMORE**

U.R. Technician

**DAVID ROSENBERG**

Research Analyst

# FINANCIAL STATEMENT

## ASSETS

### CURRENT ASSETS:

CASH IN BANK:	LOW RENT PROJECTS	URBAN RENEWAL PROJECTS	TOTALS
General Fund .....	\$ 184,549.	\$ 6,295,799.	\$ 6,480,348.
Project Temporary Loan Repayment Fund .....	—0—	72,570.	72,570.
Special Account .....	—0—	54,808.	54,808.
Petty Cash .....	3,960.	525.	4,485.
Total Cash .....	\$ 188,509.	\$ 6,423,702.	6,612,211.

### ACCOUNTS RECEIVABLE:

Tenants — Projects .....	119,167.	—0—	119,167.
Tenants — Site .....	—0—	122,421.	122,421.
Revolving Fund — Advances .....	—0—	283,000.	283,000.
Accounts Rec. — U.R.A. ....	285,009.	—0—	285,009.
Accounts Rec. — Other .....	1,486,538.	6,919.	1,493,457.
Total Accounts Receivable .....	1,890,714.	412,340.	2,303,054.
Relocation Grants Due from Federal Government .....		823,960.	823,960.

### INVENTORIES:

Fuel Oil .....	30,520.		30,520.
Tools, Equip. and Materials .....	400,333.		400,333.
Total Inventories .....	430,853.		430,853.

### ACCRUED INTEREST RECEIV- ABLE — GEN. FUND INVEST. ..

1,526. 1,526.

### INVESTMENTS: (at cost)

Investments — General Fund Acct.	123,246.		123,246.
Investments — Urban Renewal .....	—0—	5,687,256.	5,687,256.
Total Investments .....	123,246.	5,687,256.	5,810,502.

### FISCAL AGENTS' ACCOUNTS:

Debt Service Fund .....	4,532,666.		4,532,666.
Advance Amortization Fund .....	1,595.		1,595.
Total Fiscal Agents' Accts. ....	4,534,261.		4,534,261.
H.U.D. Annual Contributions Rec.	7,414,993.		7,414,993.

### DEFERRED CHARGES:

Prepaid Insurance .....	84,878.		84,878.
Insurance Deposits .....	131,612.		131,612.
Total Deferred Charges .....	216,490.		216,490.
Total Current Assets .....	14,800,592.	13,347,258.	28,147,850.

### PROJECT EXPENDITURES:

Survey and Planning Stage .....	—0—	1,256,307.	1,256,307.
Loan and Grant Stage .....	—0—	147,270,477.	147,270,477.
Donated Land .....	—0—	17,625.	17,625.
Total .....	—0—	148,544,409.	148,544,409.
Less: Sales Price Land Sold .....		5,003,657.	5,003,657.
Net Project Expenditures ....		143,540,752.	143,540,752.

### RELOCATION PAYMENTS

FIXED ASSETS .....	—0—	4,735,561.	4,735,561.
TOTAL ASSETS .....	166,573,229.	166,573,229.	166,573,229.
TOTAL ASSETS .....	\$181,373,821.	\$161,623,571.	\$342,997,392.

1.) Notes Payable — NON HUD represents funds borrowed from private sources Federally guaranteed for construction.

2.) Notes Payable — HUD represents funds borrowed from the Federal Government.

# HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK

## COMBINED BALANCE SHEET AS OF MARCH 31, 1969

### LIABILITIES & CAPITAL

#### CURRENT LIABILITIES:

ACCOUNTS PAYABLE:	LOW RENT PROJECTS	URBAN RENEWAL PROJECTS	TOTALS
Vendors and Contractors .....	\$ 59,474.		\$ 59,474.
Payroll Deductions and Cont. ....	364,553.		364,553.
Contract Retentions .....	1,322,534.	\$ 887,766.	2,210,300.
Performance Deposits .....	349,915.	73,988.	423,903.
Tenants' Security Deposits .....	66,610.		66,610.
Revolving Fund Advances .....	283,000.		283,000.
Sundry .....	398,847.	50,814.	449,661.
Accounts Payable - H.U.D. ....	33,494.		33,494.
Accounts Payable - Mgt. ....		285,009.	285,009.
Total Accounts Payable .....	\$ 2,878,427.	\$ 1,297,577.	4,176,004.

#### NOTES PAYABLE:

1.) Notes Payable - Non H.U.D. ..	17,497,000.	75,570,000.	93,067,000.
2.) Notes Payable - H.U.D. ....	—0—	6,955,475.	6,955,475.
Total Notes Payable .....	17,497,000.	82,525,475.	100,022,475.

#### ACCRUED LIABILITIES:

Interest Payable - Non H.U.D. ....	256,260.	701,445.	957,705.
Interest Payable - Bonds .....	1,858,381.		1,858,381.
Interest Payable - H.U.D. ....	463.	225,340.	225,803.
Utilities .....	564,250.		564,250.
Salaries and Wages .....	98,896.		98,896.
Insurance .....	159,008.		159,008.
Payments in Lieu of Taxes .....	613,954.		613,954.
Total Accrued Liabilities .....	3,551,212.	926,785.	4,477,997.

#### DEFERRED CREDITS:

Tenants' Prepaid Rent .....	3,184.		
Total Current Liabilities .....		3,184.	3,184.

#### FIXED LIABILITIES:

Bonds Issued .....	140,395,000.		140,395,000.
Less: Bonds Retired .....	22,791,000.		22,791,000.
Net Fixed Liabilities .....	117,604,000.		117,604,000.

#### SURPLUS:

Operating Reserve .....	393,808.		393,808.
Cumulative H.U.D. Contribution for Elderly .....	2,618,318.		2,618,318.
Cumulative Contribution for Debt Service .....	69,743,198.		69,743,198.
Book Value of Projects .....			
Conveyed H.U.D. ....	986,470.		986,470.
Unreserved Surplus .....	(33,901,796.)		(33,901,796.)
Total Supplies .....	39,839,998.		39,839,998.

#### FEDERAL GRANTS - URA

Project Capital Grants .....	50,756,541.		50,756,541.
Relocation Grants .....	4,684,004.		4,684,004.
Rehabilitation Grants .....	14,924.		14,924.
Total Federal Grants .....		55,455,469.	55,455,469.

#### LOCAL GRANTS-IN-AID

Cash .....	21,400,640.		21,400,640.
Non-Cash .....	17,625.		17,625.
Total Grants-In-Aid .....		21,418,265.	21,418,265.

TOTAL LIABILITIES & CAPITAL .....	\$181,373,821.	\$161,623,571.	\$342,997,392.
-----------------------------------	----------------	----------------	----------------

# CONTENTS

	Page No.
FOREWORD .....	3
THE DECADE OF THE 1960s .....	4
URBAN RENEWAL DIVISION .....	8
The Urban Renewal Process .....	8
Housing .....	8
Commercial Development .....	9
Industrial Development .....	9
U.R. — A Case Study .....	10
U.R. — Statistical Data .....	12, 13, 14, 15
COMMUNITY RELATIONS .....	16
RELOCATION DIVISION .....	20
Relocation — Case Studies .....	
Relocation — Statistical Data .....	
MANAGEMENT DIVISION .....	26
Public Housing .....	26
Senior Citizens .....	26
Modernization Program .....	31
Tenant Selection .....	32
Public Housing Statistical Table Index .....	42
Public Housing Statistical Data .....	43
FINANCIAL STATEMENT .....	Insert

## FOREWORD



The Rev. Thomas J. Finnegan



Joseph D. Sivoilella

In a few months, the decade of the '60s will come to an end. Although we cannot predict how future generations will view this period, those of us who have lived through it will observe its passing with mixed feelings. There are many who believe that the optimism and confidence voiced in the early '60s have been shattered and nearly destroyed. Time and time again we are reminded that significant legislation in the fields of housing, education, and social welfare did not preclude social and political turmoil. The City of Newark has been profoundly affected by the events of the '60s.

It seems such a long time past that we who were present during the infancy of public housing had to contend with the hostile opposition of various lobbies and pressure groups. "Socialism," "coddling the poor," "denying incentive to the working class." "Federal giveaways," boondoggling," — such were the arguments of the '30s and '40s, and, in truth, they can be heard even today. But we can state with assurance that the public housing, urban renewal, and relocation services provided by this Authority and its sister agencies throughout the nation have proved their value beyond a shadow of a doubt. We don't mean to imply that the job has been completed, that our cities have reached their potential. That will be possible only when we make the reclamation and rehabilitation of our urban centers our most urgent national priority.

Now, at the end of this tumultuous decade, this Authority looks forward to an intensified period of activity on behalf of urban residents in reclaiming their environment. With the cooperation of community groups, social agencies, business interests, and state and Federal government, we can, and must, remake Newark.

The Newark Housing Authority is committed first and foremost to the people who live in Newark, but we know full well that a city which lacks employment opportunities, shopping facilities, educational institutions, and a healthy business climate is a stagnant city. Therefore our efforts are designed to advance these various components in an integrated, overall manner. With this view of the city, we are always willing to work with any business, civic, or local community group which is equally interested in enhancing the future of Newark.

Much still remains to be done, but with all of us working together, the '70s will prove to be a period of unprecedented revitalization and growth for the City of Newark.

A handwritten signature of The Rev. Thomas J. Finnegan in dark ink.

The Rev. Thomas J. Finnegan  
Chairman

A handwritten signature of Joseph D. Sivoilella in dark ink.

Joseph D. Sivoilella  
Executive Director

# THE DECADE OF THE 1960'S

Of the many activities which the Newark Housing Authority conducted in the ten-year period between 1960 and 1969, four areas of outstanding progress stand out: Urban Renewal activities, Relocation of Families and Businesses, Community Relations, and Social Services and Public Housing endeavors.

## Urban Renewal

In the past decade Newark has sought to realize its potential as a viable urban center. The primary vehicle for this attempt has been the Newark Housing Authority's urban renewal program.

The early '60s marked the implementation of a massive redevelopment program in Newark with one of the highest per capita federal expenditures in the country. In the past ten years urban redevelopment has resulted in the construction of several thousand units of low and moderate income private housing for Newark's residents.

Newark's first urban renewal projects were designed to create an integrated neighborhood combining private, high-rise, moderate income housing with public housing, in a 58-acre site which contained over 1100 units of deteriorated housing. The completion of these renewal projects in 1960, R3-1 and R3-2, the high-rise Colonnade Park Apartments, which were constructed adjacent to the Columbus Homes public housing apartments, and their continued success as an integrated community, have proved both the advisability and practicability of such innovative housing complexes.

The urban renewal program is also responsible for the extensive expansion of educational facilities in Newark. Rutgers, the State University, now has a new centralized campus in downtown Newark with modern structures and facilities, one of the largest such central city educational complexes in America. Adjacent to Rutgers is the newly expanded campus of the Newark College of Engineering. The New Jersey College of Medicine and Dentistry is now a reality, housed in temporary structures next to the Martland Hospital. Essex County Community College has recently broken ground for its massive "megastructure" adjacent to the Essex County Court and office complex.

Because of this expansion, the City's role as an educational center is now more significant. Students in Newark's school system are becoming more aware of the availability of higher education in their city and can plan their futures with such a goal in mind.

In the area of industrial development, Newark has embarked on one of the most exciting and ambitious urban industrial expansion programs in America, undertaken within the City's overall urban renewal program. It is the Industrial River Project, R-121, in the far eastern sector of the city, away from any residential areas. Over forty companies have made commitments to build there, with many of them relocating from other less suitable areas of the city. Development of the R-121 site will expand the City's tax base as well as bring many new jobs to city residents.

The Gateway Project, another venture made possible by urban renewal, located across from Penn Station, will be one of the most impressive commercial complexes in the nation: it will contain a 30-story office tower, an 18-story regional headquarters for Western Electric, a 10-story motor hotel, a shopping arcade and a three-level parking garage. The total cost of this project will be \$24 million, a great deal of which will be funnelled into Newark. Other commercial enterprises, each providing a variety of office related jobs, are scattered throughout the city. These include the Newark Star-Ledger Building, the Evening News expansion, the Wiss Office Building, the Western Union Building, and the new offices of the Motor Club of America.

Industrial and commercial growth is vital to the economic well-being of a city and its residents, as the growth of educational and health facilities are necessary to its intellectual and physical well-being. Social and economic development accompany physical redevelopment. These are the goals of the urban renewal program.

### **Relocation**

The traditional concerns of the planner have been with land-use controls, zoning regulations, and physical amenities. In the 1960s efforts have been made to coordinate these activities with those of the social planner. Nowhere have the results of this cooperation been more beneficial than in the area of relocation activities. The need to locate a standard dwelling unit acceptable to the person to be relocated, and within his financial means, remains the basic problem. But of no less importance is the accessibility of jobs, schools, social service agencies, medical, recreational, and cultural facilities.

Several developments in the 60s have permitted the Newark Housing Authority to provide vastly expanded services to renewal site residents. The allocation of additional federal funds has resulted in more equitable financial compensation to displaced families and businesses. More housing has become available. There has been a substantial increase in the Relocation Division's staff. In particular, the increase in the number of staff assigned to the Relocation Division means that more attention can be given to the specific problems of each site tenant.

The Authority has vigorously pursued a policy of close cooperation with local community organizations and action groups, a policy which has proved its value in aiding families who live in urban renewal sites. It has long been known that the assistance of local community groups and social agencies is indispensable to a successful Relocation Program.

### **Community Relations and Social Services**

In 1954, the Newark Housing Authority created a department of Tenant Relations, which at that time was the first social agency anywhere in America as an organized part of the existing structure of a local public housing authority. The function of this department was to aid tenants with social, family, or personal problems to receive proper assistance. Tenants with such problems might on their own initiative seek out the caseworker for his services. However, if the problem was particularly disruptive, the Manager of the housing project could request the worker to call on the tenant.

Community Relations was created in response to a burgeoning social consciousness, and to meet an ever escalating level of social wants as well as needs in the '60s. Community Relations' earliest responsibilities were the organization and encouragement of Tenant Councils and the administration of job-training and anti-poverty programs. Neighborhood Youth Corps and the Housing



Employment Learning Project were the first concerns of Community Relations, which continue to this day when each summer the staff is involved in supervising and counselling hundreds of young men and women under the auspices of the Neighborhood Youth Corps. The long years of encouraging "grass roots" leadership through the operation of Tenant Councils has finally paid off, so that today there is a Tenant League, Council, or Association at each housing project, and a city-wide coordinating council to give added emphasis to the voice of the tenants.

In 1967, the two sections, Tenant Relations and Community Relations, were combined in one unit as the Community Relations and Social Services Section (CRSS). Within CRSS there remains a division of labor: Tenant Relations specializing in cases of individual and family pathology and generally disruptive behavior, Community Relations concentrating on community organizing, and the providing of services to groups of tenants. Among the many functions encompassed by Community Relations are: Boy Scout and Girl Scout activities, with a large number of Authority personnel directly involved as sponsors and leaders; tutorial programs, and scholarship information and referral services; senior citizens organizations providing meaningful recreational and social activities to help make the elderly feel wanted and useful; pre-school classrooms and "Head Start" facilities; teen canteens, and social and recreational programs, and information and referral services, as well as the coordination at community social agency activities within the public housing projects.

In addition, CRSS workers are assigned to the Authority's Urban Renewal and Relocation Divisions to help ease the burden of moving for families who must relocate from blighted areas. These workers are responsible both for helping Relocation Specialists to find new and standard housing for these persons, and for aiding them to adjust to their new home by coordinating the services of social agencies and community groups and organizations. Getting the children into school, finding a local church, scout troop, or women's club — these are examples of the individual attention given to relocatees.

To meet such a variety of obligation CRSS has had to vastly expand both its role and its personnel; in fact, from a humble beginning in light of the earlier days of Tenant Relations, CRSS has grown nearly 900% and now has a full-time staff of nearly 70 employees.

Thus, after a decade and a half of hard and conscientious groundwork, CRSS is prepared to face the future with a background of solid experience of community organizing and sensitive attention to the varied individual needs of the people it must help.

### **Public Housing**

The growing concern on the part of both Federal and local government for the plight of the poor, especially the elderly, shows clearly in the additions to the public housing program in Newark. In the ten-year period beginning in 1960, a total of 4,174 dwelling units were built at a cost of \$69,040,655.30, of which 2,746 units were designed especially for the elderly. These apartments for the elderly represent the largest such program in the nation. No other city in America today has as many public housing apartments designed exclusively for senior citizens.

In addition to the construction of new housing units, the Housing Authority, influenced by the new social consciousness affecting the whole nation, has encouraged tenants to form tenant organizations. As a result, a great variety of tenant groups were organized, often with the help of the Authority who provided either the space, or the staff, or often both: Golden Age Clubs, Senior Citizens Clubs, Boy and Girl Scouts, and 4H Clubs are just some examples. The Authority has

greatly expanded the staff and activities of the Community Relations section so that all tenants in need of social help or guidance may now either be aided directly or referred to a social agency able to offer assistance.

The Housing Authority has also cooperated closely with tenant groups in planning and undertaking a program of modernizing existing structures, a modernization which will cost upwards of \$15 million.

The most significant development in the past ten years in the field of public housing has been the acknowledgment on the part of the Federal and of local governments, both in terms of philosophy as well as of action, that the social aspect of project life is as important as the physical aspect. No longer do our legislators think only in terms of new buildings, they now think also in terms of community involvement and social services. This development of the 1960s gives a new meaning and greater depth to the old motto of the public housing program to provide a decent, safe and sanitary living environment for all the tenants.

Following are the locations of the public housing units built in the 1960s by the Newark Housing Authority, including the elderly projects:

- NJ 2-16 STEPHEN CRANE ELDERLY — 198 apartments for the elderly — South of Stephen Crane Village, bounded by southern line of Stephen Crane Village, NJ 2-6, the Belleville town line on Watchung Avenue and the Erie Railroad.
- NJ 2-17 OTTO E. KRETCHMER ELDERLY — 198 apartments for the elderly — East of Otto E. Kretchmer Homes, bounded by Ludlow, Carrington and VanVechten Streets.
- NJ 2-18 REV. WILLIAM P. HAYES ELDERLY — 98 apartments for the elderly — within the Rev. William P. Hayes Homes project area — on Boyd Street between West Kinney Street and 17th Avenue.
- NJ 2-19 EDWARD W. SCUDDER HOMES — 1,680 apartments, including 252 for the elderly — bounded by Howard and Broome, Mercer, Lincoln and West Kinney Streets, bisected by Court Street.
- NJ 2-21 1,000 units for the elderly in projects built on three locations; NJ 2-21A is bounded by Frelinghuysen Avenue, Virginia Street, Ludlow Street and Carrington Street; NJ 2-21E is bounded by Dayton Street, Foster Street and Frelinghuysen Avenue; NJ 2-21F is bounded by Ross Street, Evergreen Avenue and Frelinghuysen Avenue.
- NJ 2-22 1,000 dwelling units especially designed for the elderly is divided into three sub-projects, located in different areas: NJ 2-22B is bounded by Boyden, Summit, James, and Nesbit Streets; NJ 2-22C is located between Franklin Avenue and North 7th Street; NJ 2-22D is located on North Sixth Street.

# URBAN RENEWAL DIVISION

## THE URBAN RENEWAL PROCESS

Urban renewal is undertaken for two major reasons: social and economic.

When living conditions are so intolerable that they are a threat to the health, safety and welfare of the residents, some action must be taken to correct the situation. Urban renewal offers a method of replacing inadequate buildings. Site property is acquired, residents are helped to relocate, their moving expenses are paid, and the houses, or other structures, are demolished at public cost.

The economic advantages of urban renewal accrue to everyone. Residents benefit from the increased tax revenue derived from the ratables brought into the city. Urban renewal enables housing, commercial, industrial and public enterprises to expand in the city.

In urban renewal conservation projects, sound structures are restored and saved.

Urban renewal is primarily a local program with the Federal government providing policy guidelines and the bulk of the funds. It is the community itself which makes the basic decisions and actually plans and carries out the program. In Newark the local agency responsible for urban renewal is the Newark Housing Authority.

The Federal government provides three-quarters of the net project cost for Newark's urban renewal program and the city contributes one-quarter. The local share is usually in the form of needed public improvements, such as schools, police and fire stations, streets, parks and playgrounds.

Before the urban renewal program may be put into effect, families residing in the area must move. The Newark Housing Authority does everything possible to assist in the transition to a new home. Its Relocation Division helps the site residents to find new adequate housing which they can afford. Site residents receive priority in the city's several public housing projects. If they prefer private housing, they are given a choice of suitable standard apartments, or they find one on their own. If they wish, in either case a generous moving allowance is provided for a qualified site resident, and in certain situations families may receive additional funds in the form of rent supplements and outright grants. Businesses which must relocate are also given moving expenses and are reimbursed for losses they may incur.

## HOUSING

Providing standard, attractive housing is the major concern of Newark's urban renewal program. The public housing effort in Newark has provided more than 12,000 standard apartments for its citizens. The difference between public and private housing is that in public housing a tenant pays what he is able to accord to his income regardless of the size of the apartment.

Two thousand apartments in new public housing have been designed especially for senior citizens. They are in completely modern, high-rise structures with General Electric electrical kitchens, modern pastel-colored safety bathrooms with grab bars, non-skid floors, knee-high electrical outlets, community rooms and clinic facilities. These apartments are built on tree-shaded and landscaped grounds to provide tenants with an opportunity for relaxation and outdoor recreational activities.

In addition to public housing, the city's private housing program is substantial. High Park Gardens, a cooperative residential development, provides moderate-cost garden-type housing in a pleasant atmosphere of open space with lawns, playgrounds, and parking. Similar apartments are now available at University Gardens, High Park Terrace and Mt. Cavary apartments. High-rise apartments provide mid-city living for couples, small families and single persons. These structures include Brick Towers, Colonnade Park and Hallmark House. To date, more than 3,000 private apartments have been provided by urban renewal.

In addition, Newark home owners, through urban renewal, are able to acquire funds to rehabilitate their homes. Several of these rehabilitated structures will be used in Newark's eased housing program. Leased housing provides a method where the local agency (Newark Housing Authority) leases suitable apartments or structures from private landlords and then rents them to needy families. This program is most beneficial to large families who are unable to find decent housing. They may be able to rent a house or large apartment at a rent they can afford while at the same time encouraging the landlord to maintain his property up to local standards.

## COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Much of the commercial redevelopment in Newark's urban renewal program has been completed. New commercial structures include the Western Union Building, Star Ledger, the Evening News expansion, the Ford auto sales facility on Broad Street with showrooms and offices, and the Motor Club of America on Central Avenue which handles all types of insurance.

Under construction is the Gateway Project across from, and connected to, Penn Station. Included in this redevelopment will be a high-rise commercial office complex with a major motel and shopping and parking facilities joined to Penn Station by a glass-enclosed pedestrian walkway. The immediate proximity to bus and rail transportation insures the success of this venture.

These new and expanded commercial facilities make many new jobs available to Newark residents, in addition to paying taxes which will enhance the financial base of the City of Newark.

## INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Newark's central location and proximity to land, sea and air transportation makes it highly desirable as an industrial center. This asset is being developed in the meadows adjacent to Newark Airport. The Industrial River Project on this site is creating a coherent development of industrial facilities in a non-residential area. There are many advantages to this type of industrial development. The firms expanding and relocating in this area will have access to all forms of transportation and a readily available skilled labor market. Equally, Newark's skilled and semiskilled workers will find employment within easy reach. The net gain in employees for Newark from

the companies whose projects are either started, or underway or completed during 1969 will be about 5,500. By concentrating industry in the fringe-city regions, residential areas are kept free of heavy industry and its accompanying heavy traffic.

Light manufacturing and light industry is also slated for other urban renewal sites in the city where it would complement the overall urban renewal plan.

## **HEALTH SERVICES**

New and expanded hospital and health facilities are also a significant aspect of Newark's urban renewal program. These facilities include the New Jersey College of Medicine and Dentistry, the Mart and Hospital addition, a State Medical Office and Laboratory, the St. Michael's Hospital addition and the Mount Carmel Guid Multi-Service Center, which contains a day care center for retarded children, a speech and hearing center, a mental health center, and a rehabilitation center.

## **URBAN RENEWAL - A CASE STUDY**

N.J. R-6 Old Third Ward Project, was one of Newark's earliest urban renewal projects concerned with the improvement of a total neighborhood. This project is located in the Central Ward of the city and is part of the black ghetto of impoverished residents living in dilapidated structures. The project area included substantial portions of and to be cleared. However, it also included properties which were designated for appropriate rehabilitation measures, such as the Douglas Harrison apartments in the center of the project area and properties located in city blocks along High Street and Clinton Avenue.

The project area is bounded by High Street on the east, Springfield Avenue on the north, Belmont Avenue on the west, and Clinton Avenue on the south. It encompasses an area of approximately 195 acres which originally contained 5,782 dwelling units. Of these, over 4,000 were found to be dilapidated during original surveys. Such surveys also found that the area was served by extremely inadequate recreational facilities, that the schools were old and deficient, that housing was generally in extremely poor condition, and that commercial and residential units were crowded into obsolete buildings.

The planning of this very large area took place between 1955 and 1960. Due to its size and complexity it was decided to stagger the execution activities. This was done primarily in order to provide for a gradual acquisition, relocation and demolition program. Also, this would enable the Housing Authority to build in anticipation of future requirements.

Thus, the first two major new developments in this area were public housing projects. These amounted to approximately 3,000 dwelling units and were utilized primarily as a relocation resource for low income families displaced by public acquisition programs, including urban renewal of this and other areas of the City. This became particularly important in view of the fact that from the R-6 urban renewal area alone the plan proposed displacement of approximately 3,400 families.

Educational facilities are an important corollary of housing. For that reason, Newark's Board of Education built a new elementary school even before the area was turned over from the Newark Housing Authority to the City of Newark for such purposes. This was the Quitman Street School which contains approximately 1,200 student stations and replaces the old Monmouth Street School, which was found to be substandard a long time before it was actually acquired and demolished by the Housing Authority. Two other existing elementary schools, the Morton Street School and Montgomery Street School have been expanded and modernized. It is planned to replace existing Charlton Street School by a new elementary school of much greater size at a future time, as part of this urban renewal project. Under regulations governing urban renewal, the City of Newark receives credit for these schools and other public facilities towards its share of the renewal projects.

Among other public improvements are items like the John F. Kennedy Recreation Center which was constructed at a cost estimated at \$4,200,000. Also planned is a municipal park of seven acres with appropriate recreational and sport facilities, as well as a Boys Club on Avon Avenue.

Completed new construction by private developers includes 600 units of moderate income garden apartments. These were developed to provide a low-rise balance to the adjoining high-rise public and private apartment developments. An additional 776 dwelling units are now under construction under private sponsorship. Additional units of new and rehabilitated housing will be developed in the future as part of this renewal project.

Spiritual needs of the neighborhood are served by several churches of different denominations. Three of these local churches have completed new construction under urban renewal and several more will build or rehabilitate their facilities in the future.

Commercial retail facilities are developed in the center of the project area on Spruce Street. Additional ones are proposed for development in areas fronting on Springfield and Clinton Avenues. Approximately 39 acres of cleared or to be cleared land in this project area have been assigned to the Citizens Housing Council, a group of minority group residents of the City of Newark. These land areas are scheduled for development by sponsors selected and designated by the council, for either residential or commercial or a combined use.

The unique partnership of public and private investment to improve an area is the essence of the Urban Renewal Program. The process itself takes a long time, particularly in an area of the size of R-6. The neighborhood is disrupted during the project renewal activities from demolition through new construction to the provision of new utilities, new streets and the like. However, once renewal is completed, the Old Third Ward will become a model area of the City, eminently fit for human habitation.

# STATISTICAL DATA

## NEWARK'S URBAN RENEWAL PROGRAM

PROJECT NO.	PROJECT NAME	PREDOMINANT LAND USE	
		EXISTING	PROPOSED
3-1 & 3-2	Colonnade	Residential	Residential
N.J. R-6	Old Third Ward	Residential	Residential
N.J. R-32	Central Ward	Residential	Residential/Industrial
N.J. R-38	Lower Clinton Hill	Residential	Residential
N.J. R-45	Newark Colleges Expansion	Residential	Colleges
N.J. R-49	Hill Street	Commercial	Residential/Commercial
N.J. R-50	Educational Center	Commercial	Public/Semi-Public
N.J. R-52	South Broad	Commercial	Commercial/Residential
N.J. R-58	Newark Plaza	Commercial	Commercial
N.J. R-62	Essex Heights 1st Stage	Residential	Public/Commercial
N.J. R-72	Fairmount	Residential	Public/Residential
N.J. R-121	Industrial River	Industrial	Industrial
N.J. R-123	St. Benedict's	Commercial/Semi-Public	Commercial/Semi-Public
N.J. R-141	Essex Heights 2nd Stage	Residential/Commercial	Commercial
N.J. R-156	St. Michael's	Commercial	Public/Semi-Public/Residential
N.J. R-168	South Broad 2nd Stage	Residential	Residential
N.J. R-182	South Broad Industrial	Residential/Industrial	Industrial
N.J. R-196	Medical Center	Residential	Public

## COMMUNITY RENEWAL PROGRAM ESTIMATED REAL ESTATE TAXES

PROJECT NO	PROJECT NAME	REAL ESTATE TAX BEFORE U. R.	ESTIMATED COST OF DEVELOPMENT	REAL ESTATE TAX POTENTIAL
3-1 & 3-2	Colonnade	\$ 113,000		\$ 540,000
N. J. R-6	Old Th rd Ward	954,000	\$ 60,000,000	3,000,000
N. J. R-32	Central Ward	1,450,000	Rehab. & new	
N. J. R-38	Lower Clinton Hill	542,000	Rehab. & new	1,000,000
N. J. R-45	Newark Colleges Expansion	893,000	State	Exempt
N. J. R-49	Hill Street	247,000	12,000,000	600,000
N. J. R-50	Educational Center	98,000	3,000,000	150,000
N. J. R-52	South Broad	421,000	20,580,000	1,029,000
N. J. R-58	Newark Plaza	1,449,000	56,900,000	2,845,000
N. J. R-62	Essex Heights 1st Stage	291,000	22,600,000	1,130,000
N. J. R-72	Fairmount	347,000	23,608,000	1,180,000
N. J. R-121	Industrial River	2,204,000	84,000,000	4,200,000
N. J. R-123	St. Benedict's	247,000	10,400,000	520,000
N. J. R-141	Essex Heights 2nd Stage	138,000	9,600,000	480,000
N. J. R-156	St. Michael's	494,000	27,000,000	1,350,000
N. J. R-168	South Broad 2nd Stage	360,000	18,800,000	940,000
N. J. R-182	South Broad Industrial	525,000	22,000,000	1,100,000
TOTAL		\$10,773,000	\$370,488,000	\$20,064,000

## RESIDENTIAL CONSTRUCTION IN U. R. PROJECTS

COMPLETED	NO. OF APARTMENTS	MONTHLY RENT 1-BEDROOM
Colonnade	1240	\$150.00
High Park Gardens	460	90.00
Hallmark House	432	170.00
High Park Gardens Extension	138	100.00
Mt. Calvary Homes	228	121.00
University Gardens	270	123.00
Brick Towers	298	120.00

Total 3066

### IN PLANNING

High Park Gardens Extension	78
Citizens Urban Renewal Corp	400
Metropolitan Renewal Associates	260
Mt. Carme Guild	136

Total 874



# **NEWARK HOUSING AUTHORITY** **REDEVELOPMENT VALUE OF CONSTRUCTION**

		MONTH ENDING MARCH 31, 1969		
PROJECT		PERCENT COMPLETED	VALUE WORK IN PLACE (\$000)	TOTAL VALUE
<b>N.J. R-3-1</b> (20.4 Acres)	Colonnade .....	100	7250	7250
<b>N.J. R-3-2</b> (22.6 Acres)	Colonnade ....	100	7000	7000
<b>N.J. R-6</b> (204.2 Acres)	<b>Jack Parker Co-ops</b>			
<b>PARCEL</b>				
# 18	1st Section (High Park Gardens) .....	100	3000	3000
# 20	2nd Section (High Park Gardens) .....	100	4100	4100
# 6	3rd Section (High Park Terrace) .....	97	1940	2000
# 21C	4th Section (High Park Gardens) .....	55	1540	2800
# 4	Mt. Pleasant Church .....	100	375	375
# 11	Greek Orthodox Church .....	100	375	375
# 19	A&P Store #1 .....	100	300	300
	A&P Store #2 .....	100	25	25
# 12A	Israel Memorial .....	99	257	260
	<b>J.F.K. Recreation Center</b>			
# 2-2A	(Swimming Pool) .....	98	4116	4200
# 2B	(Skating Rink) .....			
# 15	Brick Towers .....	87	5329	6126
# 8A	Perry Funeral Home .....	98	88	90
<b>N.J. R-38</b> (78.2 Acres)	<b>Mt. Calvary Urban Renewal Homes</b>			
<b>PARCEL</b>				
# 2A	Building #1 .....	100	2091	2091
# 4	Building #2 .....	99	2056	2077
# 8-11	Cooper Memorial Park .....	100	427	427
<b>N.J. R-45</b> (57.0 Acres)				
<b>PARCEL</b>	<b>RUTGERS</b>			
# 5	High School .....	100	2495	2495
<b>PARCEL</b>				
# 3	(Science, Humanities Library) .....	100	7253	7253
	(Science #2) .....	97	4483	4621
	(Student Center) .....	100	1733	1733
	(Faculty Office Building) .....	26	1090	4190

PROJECT		PERCENT COMPLETED	VALUE WORK IN PLACE (\$000)	TOTAL VALUE
# 3	N.C.E. (Academic Building ) (Physical Education Building).			
# 1	(Student Center ) (Alumni Building ) (Library and Humanities )	100	5931	5931
# 2	Maintenance Building	100	2137	2137
<b>N.J. R-49</b> (12.9 Acres)				
<b>PARCEL</b>				
# 2	Hallmark House	100	6465	6465
# 7	Western Union Building	100	1350	1350
<b>N.J. R-50</b> (23.7 Acres)				
<b>PARCEL</b>				
# 3A	Mt. Carmel Guild Unit 1 (Speech, Hearing & Mental Health Center) (Rehabilitation Center & Connecting Link)	88	2516	2860
<b>N.J. R-52</b> (42.4 Acres)				
<b>PARCEL</b>				
# 7-6	Newark Star-Ledger	100	1750	2750
# 1 Pt	Autorama	100	1600	1600
# 3	University Gardens	87	4002	4600
<b>N.J. R-58</b> (50.7 Acres)				
<b>PARCEL</b>				
# 12B	Newark Evening News (Clinton Street Building) (Market Street Building)	100 100	490 1750	490 1750
# 5A-38	Gateway - Office Tower - Theatre & Motel	15.5	3720	24000
<b>N.J. R-72</b> (84.8 Acres)				
<b>PARCEL</b>				
# 21	Motor Club of America (MCA Building) (Wiss Building A) (Wiss Building B) Wiss Building C	100 100 100	1750 380 400	1750 380 400
# 18-19	Wiss Office Building	30	214	715
# 29-29A	Medical School Phase 1	32	1600	5000
<b>N.J. R-121</b> (1528.5 Acres)				
<b>PARCEL</b>				
# 70	National Twist and Drill	100	600	600

# COMMUNITY RELATIONS

and Social Services

In addition to the monumental task of combatting urban decay, the Housing Authority has committed itself to encouraging human renewal as well. Realizing that the blight of a neighborhood is often matched by the stultified life styles of its inhabitants, the Newark Housing Authority created the department of Community Relations and Social Services (CRSS) to serve as a social service and referral instrument to counter such conditions. The department's work is not confined to the city's public housing projects, but encompasses also the Urban Renewal and Reocation sites throughout the metropolitan area. The program of Community Relations is carried out by both college trained workers and so-called subprofessional aides, i.e. persons who lack a college degree but are offered training and potential upgrading on the job. CRSS's program has three distinct categories: (1) Community Relations, (2) Tenant Relations, and (3) Urban Renewal and Reocation.

Workers assigned to Community Relations (1), have a special responsibility to encourage the formation and continued viability of Tenant Leagues, Senior Citizens Clubs, youth recreation and education activities, and to encourage, support and supervise programs in the general areas of health, recreation, education, welfare, counseling, and job training/retraining. These workers are expected to be aware of other programs for which this population might be eligible, whether they be sponsored by a local agency or by the Federal government. Such awareness presumes and requires liaison with community agencies, both public and private, and results in an attempt to establish a pool of technical, professional, recreational, and cultural resources for the satisfaction of a full range of interests, needs, and talents of tenants.

Those workers allotted for Tenant Relations (2) follow through on referrals initiated by a Project Manager and channelled through the CRSS office. The worker is expected to take investigative, evaluative, and within the realistic limitations of his professional competency, remedial action. In the process, he is also expected to observe criteria of objective reporting and careful analysis in order to facilitate the transmission of pertinent information in instances of referrals or staff conferences. This includes documentation of services rendered and any contacts made with the tenant involved, coordinating agencies and other professional personnel. Other functions include the supplying of guidance, personal counseling, referral services and general welcoming activities for families moving into public housing, and the provision of similar services for those families moving from public housing to the private housing sector.

Community Service Workers assigned to Urban Renewal and Reocation sites, operate in concert with the Urban Renewal and Reocation Divisions of the Newark Housing Authority, under the direct supervision of a Senior Community Service Worker, and overall coordination by a Community Resources Specialist. Primary duties of such workers are the dissemination of information on the laws, guidelines, and stated aims of Urban Renewal, and the familiarization of the residents of such sites with the rights under law and with the services to which they are entitled. A vital function is to encourage the formation of neighborhood groups and to assist in the mobilization of all the community's resources to play a significant role in the direction of the Urban Renewal process to benefit residents and reduce the harshness associated with change. The amelioration of the various social problems associated with relocating families, including referral to the proper public and private welfare agencies, is the special province of the Community Service Workers. The search for new quarters and help in the establishing of new roots is also considered the specialty of this Worker. New roots are enhanced by the carefully nurtured liaison with churches, schools, recreational and vocational facilities, and the many other community groups which welcome and enrich the life of a family.

The department seeks to make more bearable the process of moving for those who must relocate, and to make richer and more meaningful the life style of those who live in public housing. The fact that public housing was constructed as an artificial community is no justification for it remaining as such. The development of a sense of community within the project and a feeling of inter-relationship with the larger neighborhood as well is encouraged with the goal of preventing the inaction and stagnation likely in their absence.

CRSS has basically two schedules: a frantic summer agenda, and a slightly less hectic continuing program. The summer program was so described because of the prevalence of activities designed for school age youngsters during the summer months. The Authority sponsors many such programs and seeks out sponsorship from agencies, groups, and individuals with constructive and meaningful programs, permitting them to utilize its facilities. Churches, scouting groups, Anti-Poverty agencies, Police Department, the City all sponsor programs in and around Public Housing, about which tenants must be made aware. Such programs often partake of the space, time, personnel, and facilities of Housing Authority itself.

Last summer, 1968, the Authority and the United Community Corporation (UCC) hosted a Pre-Fall Festival, which included such attractions as beauty contest, one-act play, choral presentation, jazz concert, and tumbling and gun twirling exhibitions. The Authority, the JCC and the Amateur Athletic Union sponsored an extensive program of exhibition boxing both for the training of the participants and for the entertainment and pride of the community.

A project tumbling team was organized and sponsored by Community Relations after observing youngsters dragging old mattresses into the courtyards to play at gymnastics. Project equipment and trained supervision were provided, which resulted in a corps of forty tumbling enthusiasts who put on a series of exhibitions for the families, friends and the community. Documentary films were taken and a tenant supported Family Night raised money for uniforms.

The Girl Scout Council of Greater Essex County provided supervision and activities for project and project-area girls at Kretschmer, Columbus, Wash., Pennington-Hyatt-Roosevelt, Lower Clinton Hill Urban Renewal Rehabilitation Center and the Hayes Homes environs, including Scudder, Wright and Fuld Homes. Additionally, these girls experienced the true scouting camping tradition at the South Mountain Oval and were treated to a summer of crafts, woodwork, and swimming. The N.H.A. contributed the workshop and to let facilities, playground space, water and maintenance service at each of the previous named projects, and also shared the responsibility with the Girl Scouts for publicity and recruiting.

The Robert Treat Boy Scout Council was also extremely active in conjunction with the N.H.A. The Council sponsored a Housing Scouting Olympics which was held at Weequahic Park. Fifty-nine scouting units and in excess of two thousand youngsters registered and took part in the competition. The enthusiasm and youthful exuberance of the participants typified the boys that Scouting has reached and somehow transformed. The Housing Authority has traditionally supported Scouting activities, with the fellowship, character-building and self-reliance which they promote. The Executive Director and individual Project Managers, as well as lesser known N.H.A. employees on down the line have given unstintingly of their time and effort to foster Scouting in the urban environment. The Authority, in fact, employs two full-time consultants on Boy and Girl Scout activities.

The Fabian Swim and Cabana Club was made available to the U.C.C., and several thousand youngsters from the housing projects were transported there to enjoy the facilities of the Club and

the free lunches provided for them. Other thousands of youngsters were treated to bus excursions to such points of interest as Turtle Back Zoo, the Bronx Zoo, New Jersey Arts Center, Lake Hopatcong, Ringwood Manor, Yankee Stadium, and a New Jersey Fish Hatchery, all through the auspices of the Milt Campbell Center and other community organizations.

The Authority sponsored two inter-city softball leagues whose schedule of activities were played on special lots at Urban Renewal cleared and called Resurrection Fields. These fields were also available all summer to any and all city youth in search of play areas.

A brief list of other activities for, by, and in public housing will give a fuller picture of the extent of community involvement and cooperation in last summer's program. Board of Education recreation programs, Operation Roundabout movies and recreation, L.C.C. Play Streets, Fluid Neighborhood House, educational, cultural, and recreational programs, Afro American Association, teen canteen, Rutgers university tutoring and recreational activities, Ste. a Wright Boys' Club, camping, swimming, crafts, cookouts, and recreation, Friendly Neighborhood House, day camp, crafts and excursions, Musicians' Local 16, free music lessons, and the various churches which contributed their share to making the summer more meaningful. St. Lucy, St. Bridget, St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Francis (Redeemer's Park), Queen of Angels, St. Patrick Church, and volunteer services and the Newark Apostolic Committee.

The program of greatest scope and with the greatest degree of involvement is undoubtedly the Neighborhood Youth Corps. Youth Corps is a supervised, work experience, job-training program for young men and women between the ages of fourteen and twenty-two who are either in school or have dropped out. Job categories included Homemaker Aide, Maintenance Assistant, Clerical, and Typing Assistants. Community Relations Assistant, Urban Renewal Education Assistant, and Tiny Tots Aide. Four hundred and fifty youngsters were employed in this program by the Authority last summer.

The year-around schedule is suggested by the Workers' duties described previously. Tenant Leagues, Senior Citizens Clubs, job training facilities, tutorial programs, recreational supervision, and information and referral services indicate the range of activities in a skeletal manner. The implementation is bounded only by the resources and imagination of CRSS, although the imagination is limitless, the physical and financial resources are slightly more limited. Newark's Housing Authority was the first public housing agency in the nation to initiate a social work program within its own framework, and therefore has years of experience in the providing of maximum personal services with a minimum of financial resources.

Tenant Associations represent a longstanding priority of CRSS. They serve the tenants by helping to (1) effectively articulate their needs, (2) foster a sense of solidarity as a community, and (3) develop leadership in the community at a true grass roots level. After several years of painstaking nurture, each housing project in the city currently has a Tenant Association with an Authority-wide Tenant Council to stimulate interaction and to encourage communication among the separate projects.

The Authority is a so-called special concern for a group of citizens who have been too often overlooked in the past: Senior Citizens. The recent construction of two thousand new apartments designed especially for these older residents is a manifestation of this interest in their well-being, as is the encouraging of cultural and recreational activities in a congenial "social club" setting. Currently there are Senior Citizens and Golden Age Clubs operating within each project in the

Authority, serving some 4,200 persons. Games, hobbies, choral singing, crafts, millinery and dress-making, surplus food and free lunch programs are among the services provided these senior citizens.

Information, counseling, and referral are the special commodities dispensed at the CRSS information centers at Hayes, Scudder, Stella Wright and Columbus housing projects. Homemaker improvement, applications for job-training and Anti Poverty programs, Scouting, 4-H, and other constructive activities for youth and adults are all on the varied agenda of these centers. Beyond the confines of the housing projects themselves, Community Relations and Social Services is active, cooperating with various community and neighborhood agencies to provide similar services in each of the city's Urban Renewal and Re-education sites.

Health as well as social needs are recognized by the Authority and CRSS as an important area in which to serve the population of public housing. Baby-Keep-Well stations operated by the city's Department of Health are located within housing projects; five Dental facilities are also available.

Community Relations and Social Services seeks to serve the full range of physical, social, educational, vocational, and recreational needs of its clientele. Such goals necessitate the innovative handling of resources and a carefully established liaison with other repositories of social welfare assets. CRSS is interested in more than the physical needs of its populace. The long-range goal is not to meet the minimum demands and perpetuate a marginal life style, but rather to enrich and upgrade the life style in whatever manner is considered feasible and creatively functional.

# RELOCATION DIVISION

## THE RELOCATION PROCESS

The construction of a new school, office building or industrial facility affects the quality of life of all the residents of a city. The search for a new home means locating that particular place which fulfills individual needs and reflects individual values. Urban renewal in the city may in the long run create a good public result, but in the short run may conflict with the interests of individual citizens who are asked to change their places of residence so that these changes may occur. In order to make these adjustments as painless as possible, it is necessary for the urban renewal agency to assist those residents who are relocated to find new quarters. In Newark, the Relocation Division of the Newark Housing Authority carries out this responsibility for a changing residents of urban renewal sites to find new homes.

The process of matching people with suitable housing necessitates planning many months in advance because the Division treats every person, family, and businessman individually. In order to obtain Federal approval and funding for an urban renewal project, the Newark Housing Authority is required to submit a Relocation Program. This Program is in accordance with the legal requirements, contained in Title I of the 1949 Housing Act, that the local governments have the responsibility of aiding people affected by displacement programs, and must develop a "feasible method" of locating "decent, safe, and sanitary" dwellings at rents within the financial means of those displaced.

The first step in the process of relocation is having trained interviewers make a field survey to determine exactly how many persons, commercial concerns, and non-profit organizations are situated on the properties to be acquired. A site occupant card is filled out for each multi-person family and single person family. The record catalogues family and population characteristics (such as name and address, race, size of family, number and age of children and adults, number of elderly or hand capped people, size and source of annual income, eligibility for public housing) and housing characteristics (such as size of apartment or house, type and condition of housing, and description of facilities). The record-keeping procedures for commercial establishments are similar.

The Authority thus knows in advance the number of people and businesses that will have to assist in carrying through its plans for the area. These statistics enable the relocation staff to estimate the rehousing requirements (number of units and their size) of the people residing on properties scheduled for acquisition.

Project execution—acquisition of real estate parcels, demolition of structures, relocation activities and land disposition—begins with the Loan and Grant Contract and the initial request for Federal funding. This contract represents the Federal government's formal approval of the Newark Housing Authority's proposed plans for the redevelopment of the site.

A relocation field office is set up in the project area. At this time a 100% re-survey of the entire site area is made. Periodic surveys help to maintain up-to-date statistics concerning site occupants. As a result of these planning and follow-up surveys, the staff has at hand a profile of each occupant and business establishment within that particular urban renewal area, as well as a record of any movement of families and businesses.

When the site office receives notification of a property acquisition, it assigns a field worker to assist the tenants on that property. This is a critical moment in the relocation process. The field worker had described the relocation program to the tenant at the time of the initial interview. Now he reviews the housing and financial assistance available. The field worker re-evaluates the housing requirements of each family or individual and notes any changes in the family situation that may have occurred since the initial contact. He distributes informational material detailing financial aids and resource housing. If the tenant cannot visit the field office during regular working hours, the worker will arrange a special appointment. It is the responsibility of the field office personnel to take the initiative for providing advice and guidance to site residents. Frequent home visits offer the best means for face-to-face contacts.

The more the field office knows about a family, of course, the better service it will be able to provide. No one is obligated to receive a relocation worker into his home and it is important therefore that the field worker does not make the tenant feel that his visit is an invasion of privacy, but a means by which he can obtain useful information for the purpose of assisting him. The Authority recognizes that its field personnel must be responsive and sensitive to the needs of its clients and that the ability to achieve cooperation and understanding requires specially trained personnel. The Relocation Division conducts its own training sessions with this in mind.

The entire staff of a field office is at the service of all site residents. In addition, the Department of Community Relations and Social Services, which works closely with the Relocation Division, arranges a series of community meetings. These meetings enable the Authority to speak with the residents of the neighborhood and to present an overview of the urban renewal plans and relocation activities proposed for their particular area. The Relocation Division recognizes that it must give the area residents complete information concerning its role and its services. Knowledge about the project prevents the spread of rumors, panic, and hostility which ignorance invariably creates.

Members of the Newark Housing Council, a community group, are employed by the Newark Housing Authority to work as Relocation Assistants in the field offices. These community representatives are additional links between the Relocation Division and the neighborhood residents. Although a community representative is attached to a field office, his contacts are not limited to a given people within the boundaries of an urban renewal area; he is free to operate wherever he feels people need his advice.

Another participant in the relocation process is the New Jersey Department of Community Affairs, a state agency. As authorized by the Relocation Assistance Law of 1967, this Department reviews and approves the relocation plan and lends technical assistance. It supplies informational material to site residents concerning civil rights and discriminatory practices. Any tenant or businessman who believes that any action or ruling resulting from the Authority's relocation procedures has been unfair is entitled to file an application for a hearing before the Commissioner.

Despite numerous attempts to convince site residents that they will under no circumstances have to vacate their homes until they have been acquired by the Housing Authority and new accommodations located for them, families sometimes move within the same site or to other renewal areas. If this is the case, they will only have to move again at a future date. If a family cannot be



traced, they remain a "lost" family, and will lose financial benefits for which they are eligible as families living on a site at the date of Loan and Grant. The Division does not "subtract" from its workload those families who are classified as "MPAs" (moves prior to acquisition). Instead, the Relocation Division makes every effort to locate such families through its tracing program. It approaches agencies with whom the family may have had some contact, such as the Welfare Department, the Board of Education, and Public Service Gas and Electric Co. Places of employment have proven to be a good source for obtaining current addresses. As a last resort, the Housing Authority advertises in local newspapers.

The relationship between a site occupant in an acquired property and the Housing Authority is one of tenant and landlord. The field worker informs the tenant that he must pay his rent on the first of each month at the Relocation field office. The Authority, in turn, is responsible for the maintenance of the property until it is demolished. Should the tenant be in need of emergency repairs, he is advised how and where to notify the maintenance staff. If an examination of the family's circumstances reveals hardship conditions or an obvious inability to pay rent at the present rate, at the recommendation of the site manager and with the approval of the Director of Relocation, a rent reduction will go into effect for the remainder of tenancy.

Once the housing needs of each household have been determined, specific housing types and preferences are reviewed. In recent years the Authority has been able to take advantage of several new programs which have increased the supply and availability of housing for site tenants. The degree of success in carrying out any relocation plan is dependent on the available supply of standard low and moderate-income housing units, both public and private. The availability of Leased Housing Units, the application of rent supplements (authorized by the Housing Act of 1955), the construction of federally assisted moderate-income developments such as Mt. Calvary Homes, Brick Towers, University Gardens, and the construction of 2,000 public housing units for the elderly, have all vastly increased the supply of available housing. In particular, these innovative housing supplements enable the Newark Housing Authority to place low-income families in decent, private housing, alleviating the pressure to concentrate these families in public projects or any single neighborhood. (For a detailed description of new private and public construction and rehabilitation activities, see the Urban Renewal Section.)

Site residents have priority in admission to a such housing. In addition, where eligibility for housing is determined by income, relocatees may have higher income levels for admission acceptance. A Division of Referral and Listings maintains up-to-date files on vacant apartments throughout the city. The Division obtains its information through contacts with real estate brokers, building superintendents, apartment owners, and managers, and by daily perusals of the real estate sections of local newspapers. Lists of FHA- and VA-acquired properties are also available for inspection. The field worker and tenant interviewer work together in assisting the family with the processing of applications for whatever type of resource housing they prefer.

Every dwelling unit that is offered to a site resident as a potential housing resource must be decent, safe, and sanitary, and must be inspected by a member of an inspection staff to determine whether it conforms to the local housing code. When a family has self-relocated to a substandard apartment, the field worker will offer the Authority's help in locating a standard apartment with the usual financial assistance. If the family for some reason does not choose to move, the inspection staff will attempt to upgrade the unit by pointing out its deficiencies to the landlord and by seeking his cooperation in making minor repairs. If the landlord refuses

to cooperate, the worker reports this to the Department of Building Inspections at City Hall. Units failing to meet minimum requirements in multi-family dwellings are reported to the State Department of Community Affairs.

As mentioned previously, the Community Relations and Social Services (CRSS) Department works closely together with the Relocation Division. CRSS staff are assigned to field offices. Relocation services, once limited to providing lists of available vacancies, now include a full range of social counseling. The site office manager and/or field worker brings cases to the attention of the social service staff in those instances where additional professional assistance may be required. Recognizing that the creation of a livable urban environment is only partially accomplished by providing adequate housing, this counseling includes guidance where needed in the areas of health and welfare. In addition to guidance and counseling, the CRSS is concerned with more immediate problems as well. Providing transportation for a family for the purpose of inspecting an available apartment is one example. The CRSS case worker does not abandon the family when they finally move. He continues to visit them periodically to help them adjust to their new environment. The CRSS Division has made 2,453 social service contacts with site residents in the past eleven months.

Federal appropriations, which limit the amount of financial assistance the Housing Authority can provide, have increased since 1949. The Federal government bears 100% of the costs of compensation to displaced families, individuals and businesses.

This year, for example, any home owner of a one- or two-family house residing on the property for at least one year prior to August 1, 1968, is eligible to receive a Replacement Housing Payment of up to \$5,000 to assist him in purchasing a new home. This is in addition to the payments covering certain settlement costs and related charges connected with the purchase of his property. The period during which a family or an individual may receive an Additional Relocation Payment has now been extended from 12 months to 24 months; the maximum payment remains \$500 per year. This type of compensation first went into effect in 1964 as the Relocation Adjustment Payment. To qualify, a family or an individual above the age of 62 or handicapped, must earn no more than a specified amount; there must be no units available in either public housing or federally assisted middle income developments; present occupancy must be in a private, sanitary dwelling; and a claim must be filed within 60 days of change of residence. The maximum reimbursement for moving expenses remains at \$200. This payment is for expenses incurred by moving household furnishings, storage charges up to one year, and property loss.

Similar services are available to businesses in renewal areas. These businesses receive assistance from the Business Relocation Claims Section in locating new sites within the city, in obtaining loans from the Small Business Administration, and in processing relocation payments covering moving expenses and direct property losses.

The following three cases are from the files of one relocation field office. They are examples of the kinds of help needed and given.

#### **Case "A"**

The Housing Authority first contacted Mrs. A, a middle-aged mother of three, while making the initial survey of the site. A field worker contacted her again after the official site approval date. His primary concern was twofold: to inform her that a standard well-equipped apartment would be found for her, and to tell her about the financial aid she would be entitled to receive.

Mrs. A. expressed interest in entering one of the new Federal-assisted, moderate-income housing developments in the city a detailed description of which she had heard from the field worker during an earlier visit. At that time she was living in a five-room apartment for which she paid \$120.00 rent. With the aid of the relocation assistant she filled out the necessary forms which included a Public Housing application. A referral to a F.H.A. consultant was made on the following day. During a morning appointment with the F.H.A. representative in Newark, Mrs. A. filled out and signed a Certificate of Eligibility for the approval of the New Jersey Department of Community Affairs in Trenton. Within a month the Relocation office informed Mrs. A. that she was eligible, had been approved for a rent supplement, and that a five-room apartment had been found for her in the new Mt. Calvary Apartments.

The relocation assistant helped to organize the family's packing and made arrangements for a moving company to schedule Mrs. A.'s departure. The move went smoothly and the Central Office speedily approved \$140.00 moving fee plus a \$40.00 Property Loss Claim. The Property Loss Claim covered items such as the rug, refrigerator and venetian blinds which Mrs. A. found she could neither take nor use in her new Mt. Calvary home. The full rent for her new apartment is \$163.00 per month, of which Mrs. A. pays \$103.00 a month, while the rent supplement comes to \$60.00. Mrs. A.'s situation will be reviewed at definite intervals to determine whether her financial circumstances warrant a change in the amount of the rent supplement.

#### **Case "B"**

Unlike Mrs. A., Mrs. B. and her four children needed the entire range of counseling services provided by the site office.

The field office first became aware of Mrs. B.'s family while making the initial survey. The field worker left the pertinent relocation information. However, several months later, the relocation worker assigned to Mrs. B.'s block discovered that she had moved without notifying the site office. By the end of the month the Central Office of the Housing Authority and the Essex County Welfare Board had supplied sufficient information to locate Mrs. B. An inspection of her new apartment was made, and she was informed of the existing code violations within the building. Mrs. B. was urged to file for her Relocation Adjustment Payment within 60 days. The following month she filed an application for Public Housing and a community worker was assigned to her. Together they dealt with Mrs. B.'s need for furniture and homemaker services while her family's housing application was being processed. Two months later Mrs. B. and her family moved into Stella Wright Homes, where her rent is \$83.00 a month.

#### **Case "C"**

In a Relocation office, assisting fire victims is a common occurrence. Mr. and Mrs. C. were the victims of a fire last winter. They were immediately placed in temporary quarters while the Relocation Worker searched for a suitable permanent home. The site office provided food for the family and within a month found them a permanent standard apartment. The moving fee of \$177.00 was paid by the Relocation Division.

As these examples show, relocation is a dynamic process. It reflects changes in Federal legislation, social attitudes, community pressures and economic conditions. It is a method being continuously refined and improved. Above all, it is a means of matching individual needs and local

agency aids to produce a satisfactory environment for all who live and work in Newark. The relocation process depends heavily upon the ability of the Relocation Division to foresee and to acknowledge the housing requirements, the social needs and the civic demands of its tenants. As of today, this effort is in full swing.

The following tables are a statistical reporting of relocation site activities. They are divided into two sections: (1) site activities during the time period March 31, 1968 to March 31, 1969 and (2) a discussion of the workload since the inception of each urban renewal project.

# DIVISION MANAGEMENT

## PUBLIC HOUSING

The year 1969 witnessed an important breakthrough in public housing in Newark: two thousand apartments, especially designed for Senior Citizens, were completed and opened for occupancy. The Newark Housing Authority, which administers the Public Housing Program and is Newark's largest landlord, now has 12,721 units under its management, occupied by approximately 39,000 people.

As an important governmental agency in the City of Newark, the Housing Authority must be aware of and sensitive to the needs of its citizens, and it is in response to this awareness that the additional 2,000 units for the elderly were built.

## SENIOR CITIZENS

Several factors make it necessary to treat the elderly as a special group. The first is the large and increasing number; second is the size and nature of their households; third concerns the economic status; fourth concerns the physical change that takes place in an individual when he reaches an advanced age; fifth concerns the special social needs; and the last concerns the need for housing.

Although the Newark Housing Authority's primary function is to satisfy this last need for housing, it is neither the least important of the above, nor is it the Authority's only concern. On the contrary, it is the awareness of the totality of the senior citizens' special condition which is the motivating factor behind the construction of the new two thousand units.

One out of every eleven persons in the United States is sixty-five years of age or over, and their number is growing at the rate of over 1,000 a day.\*

\*This data was obtained from *New Population Facts on Older Americans, 1960*. A staff report to the special committee of aging with a statistical supplement prepared by H.E.W. Special Staff on Aging, 1961.

The aged portion of the population is increasing both numerically and as a proportion of the total population. Since the beginning of the century the number of persons aged sixty-five and over has increased 438%, from 3,100,000 to 16,600,000, while the total population has increased only 136%. Older people represented only 4.1% of the population in 1900; today they make up to 9.6%.\*

In the ten years between 1950 and 1960, the aged population increased by nearly 35%, a rate of growth exceeded only by children aged five to fourteen. In contrast, the total population increased by 18.5% during this decade.

An important characteristic of aging is that women outlive men. It is interesting to note that while in 1960 there were 103.6 males to 100 females under age fifteen, this proportion was reversed with the age group twenty to twenty-four. When the age group sixty-five to sixty-nine was reached there were only 87.3 males per 100 females. At seventy-five years and over, there were only 74.4 men for every 100 women. Stated in another way, of all persons sixty-five and over, 55% are women. It is the experience of this Authority that the sex ratio in Public Housing is even more in favor of women; the statistics in this report indicate that the current elderly population is composed of 34% men and 66% women. (See Table 25.) The reason for this might well be that elderly couples are less likely to seek Public Housing than single people, and more elderly men are still married.

Although the proportion of older people was not expected to increase at the same rate in this decade (1960-70) as in the preceding one, it was, nevertheless, estimated that by 1970 there will be 20 million persons over sixty-five years of age (in 1968 there were 19,129,000 persons 65 years of age or over), and that by 1980 the number will reach 24.5 million. Predictions made by H.E.W. indicate that by the year 2000 the total number of those over sixty-five will be 30,000,000. Since requirements for admittance to Public Housing under the "Senior Citizen" category call for a person or his spouse to be sixty-two years of age or older, it can easily be seen that the potential population for whom the government will have to assume some responsibility is going to be larger than the sixty-five and over group. If in this estimate one includes the average life expectancy, which rose from 48.2 in 1900 to 70.2 years in 1961, the enormity of the potential problem becomes obvious.

The ramifications of the larger proportion of women in the aged population are far greater than a mere observation of the statistics might suggest. For example, in 1960 nearly half of all the aged in the United States were widowed, single, or divorced; this represented 35% of the aged women and 13% of the aged men. Since their offspring had already left home by this stage, this meant a large proportion of small households. The 1960 census data indicate, in fact, that one out of every five aged households contained only one person and another 54% contained only two. In Newark's Public Housing the average elderly family is composed of 1.5 persons, including a larger number of single person families than those composed of two or more. (See Table 24.)

The average aged household, therefore, is significantly smaller than the average for the non-elderly as well as the total population. In Newark's Public Housing the average non-elderly family is composed of 4.3 persons, while the average family composition for the total population is 3.3 persons. (See Table 24.)

Most older people continue to live in their own households. For the total group of men over sixty-five in 1960 (U.S. Census Population Statistics) 83% still maintained their own households, 13% lived in households of others, usually their children's, and the remaining 4% lived in group quarters, usually some kind of institution. Women were more likely to reside with others and a slightly greater number (5% instead of 4% for men) lived in institutions.

\* 1968 data obtained from the Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1969.

Let us look at how economic status sets this group apart from younger age groups. Most aged are retired. This means of course that they no longer have income from earned wages or salaries. Since they generally receive only Social Security payments (or other retirement benefits) the income declines drastically. Census data for 1959 show that while the median income for a family was \$5,660 it declined to \$3,050 for husband-wife families where the head was 65 years or older. For aged individuals living without a spouse, it was even lower, \$1,342 for men and \$916 for women. The 1969 data contained in this report indicates that in Public Housing in Newark this year the median income for the non-elderly population was about \$4,500 while the median family income of the elderly was just over \$2,000 per year. (See Table 16B.) In a Cornell University study conducted by Gen H. Beyer in 1961 and entitled *Economic Aspects of Housing for the Aged*, it is pointed out that elderly people living with their spouse had higher incomes than unattached men, and unattached men had higher incomes than unattached women. Also in each category persons living in their own households had higher incomes than those living in the households of others. The Cornell study especially emphasized that if the resources of either the elderly persons or of the children permit independent living on the part of the aged person, they tend to live in that manner. The only exceptions are those elderly persons who are not self-sufficient due to health reasons.

On the matter of health there have been some important changes in public attitude with respect to the elderly. A century ago it was often considered that an old person must be a sick person. Today aging is looked upon as a process rather than as a state of being. There is no single point in time when individuals achieve a state of 'oldness'. Changes are always in progress and each person is different from all others and should be dealt with as an individual. These facts make it dangerous to generalize with regard to the health status of the aged as a group.

On the other hand, it is known that both the incidence and the prevalence of chronic disease and impairment increase with age. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare has indicated that older persons are twice as likely as those under sixty-five to have one or more chronic conditions. On the basis of data collected in the National Health Survey covering the period July, 1957 to June, 1959, it was reported that 149 per 1,000 persons aged sixty-five and over had a heart condition, 129 per 1,000 had high blood pressure, and 266 per 1,000 had arthritis or rheumatism.

Although it is clear that physical changes are always in progress, adaptation to these changes is an individual matter. An older person can, and many do, adapt to many infirmities. This does not mean, however, that the infirmities should be overlooked. It should be remembered, for example, that older people frequently have a diminishing field of vision, a decline in the sense of smell and muscular elasticity, and increased sensitivity to heat and cold. These factors should be compensated for when new housing is designed for them. The two thousand new units just constructed in Newark took full advantage of this knowledge, which is amply reflected in the design of the buildings, as well as in the location and choice of the many apartment amenities.

Other major distinguishing characteristics of the elderly can be described as being social and emotional in nature. Social and emotional problems are much more difficult to measure than economic and health problems, but their effects are at least as real. It has long been known, for instance, that forced retirement often immediately precedes a mental or physical (or both) breakdown of the retiree.

Two primary social roles, those of work and parenthood, are relinquished by individuals who have reached an advanced age. Since everyone's self image is directly related to his social role,

especially to the two so important, the loss presents serious problems of readjustment. Serious gaps have been left that must be filled by other social roles if the person's emotional equilibrium is to be maintained.

The problem of loneliness so prevalent among older people, is often different from that of isolation. The elderly may not be isolated but they may not have the warm, friendly contacts they so sorely need. Because of the situation in which many elderly find themselves, they lose their sense of belonging to the community. Many of their acquaintances are gone; new, younger people have taken over, and the friends who are capable of sharing the situation are fewer in number. In addition, in a society such as ours which values youth and newness above age and experience, the feeling of being excluded is that much more intensified. It is to this problem that the architects of senior citizen housing addressed themselves. By providing community rooms, recreation halls, hobby rooms and libraries in each new building, the elderly tenants are encouraged to engage in group activities, to make friends and thus foster within themselves a sense of belonging, a knowledge that they are not alone and their situation not unique.

Perhaps one of the most serious emotional problems concerning the aged is the loss of feeling of security. Many, as already pointed out, are in a precarious economic position but they also have other fears. Not the least of these is where they will be living as they get older. Study after study shows that elderly people are most reluctant to move even if their dwellings are somewhat uncomfortable for that is where they feel secure. When they do move it is because they are either forced to, or because the new quarters are so attractive as to overcome their fears. It has long been known by private landlords as well as administrative officials of public housing that senior citizens are consistently punctual rent payers. It is the sense of insecurity, their fear of being left without a home, that is behind this patterned behavior.

Housing for the elderly is often similar to the problems affecting the health. Age in itself is not a bad feature of housing, but frequently with age go features that do make for undesirable housing: poor structural condition, poor planning, inadequate facilities, and location in rundown neighborhoods. It is known that older people are more likely than younger people to have poor housing. According to the U. S. Bureau of Census, in 1960 one out of every five housing units occupied by families having a head sixty years of age or over was dilapidated or lacked some plumbing facilities. An appreciably greater proportion of deficiencies was found in dwelling units occupied by families having an income under \$1,000 a year than among those occupied by families in the higher income brackets. A total of 22% of those families lacked hot running water and 29% lacked a complete bath. Also, 26% had no direct source of heat in the bathroom and an equal proportion lacked direct heat in the bedroom. A total of 43% had access to the bathroom only through other rooms. These percentages declined somewhat when the income group \$1,000 to \$2,000 was considered, and declined even more for the \$2,000 to \$3,000 income group.

It was discovered that among units occupied by the aged living in their own households, those occupied by widowed or single men contained more deficiencies than those occupied by widowed or single women, and those occupied by widowed or single women had appreciably more deficiencies than those occupied by married couples.

Finally the question of attitude has to be considered. If any program of any kind is to succeed, it has to take into account the attitudes of those for which it is designed. Public housing for the elderly is no exception.



It has been shown that many older persons live under housing conditions that ought to be improved. For example, many elderly do not need as much space as they have in their present places, and they often are not able to care for that space. Others live in houses which in addition to being too large are poorly planned, old and because they are old, need many repairs. Despite these problems, most elderly people do not want to move. Some of the reasons have already been discussed. Yet, it is a fact of modern-day life that many of them will move sometime during the remainder of their lifetime, and this fact makes it important to know something about their attitudes toward various living arrangements.

Here again the Cornell data is most informative. In order to obtain information concerning the attitudes of the elderly toward different kinds of living arrangements, the Cornell Research team asked respondents what kind of arrangement they thought was best for people over sixty-five. The question asked what arrangement they thought best for elderly "who can take care of themselves" and what arrangement they thought best for those "no longer able to take care of themselves."

The persons studied were given a choice of three situations for elderly who can take care of themselves. These situations, and the proportion of the total group responding to each, were as follows: (a), to live by themselves but near relatives, 52%, (b) to live by themselves away from their relatives, 31%, (c) to live with their families, 17%.

The results of the survey followed closely the arrangements in which the respondents were living. 81% were living in their own households and 18% were not living in their own households. However, despite the comparability of the above figures, many elderly people actually suggested an arrangement different from their own. For example, approximately half of those not living in their own households recommended living by themselves, and this was offset by about an equal number who were living by themselves but who felt it would be better to live with their families. There were two primary reasons for the latter preference: either advanced age or poor health.

An interesting side light is the fact that the choices of widowed single men were quite different from those of couples and widowed, single women. For example, a higher proportion of those men who lived alone (52%) than couples (37%), or widowed single women (35%) thought that the best arrangement was for the aged to live by themselves away from relatives.

Age had some influence on the stated choices of living arrangements, but perhaps this factor was not as important as might have been expected. Among respondents who presently were living with their children (or had children living with them), three-fifths of those eighty years and over compared with two-fifths of those under age seventy thought that living with their families was the best arrangement for the elderly. As the preference for living with relatives increased with age, there was a corresponding decrease in the percentage who thought elderly should live by themselves but near relatives. (The choice for living by themselves, away from relatives remained about the same.) The influence of health also was more limited than might have been expected. For example, among those who lived in their own households, 21% of the respondents in the poorest health favored living with their families compared with 7% of those in good health who favored this arrangement.

As can be seen from the above discussion, the vast majority of the self-sufficient elderly persons, regardless of age, prefer to live in their own households. That the public housing projects for senior citizens in Newark are geared toward the stated desires of the elderly for independent households, can only add to the success of the program. The Newark Housing Authority's efforts in making life in the projects easier and socially enriching will contribute to the general well-being of its elderly tenant population, and thus what might be viewed simply as so many dwelling units, will in fact become so many homes.

## MODERNIZATION PROGRAM

Shortly after Secretary Weaver announced a program for upgrading low-income housing, the Newark Housing Authority applied for an initial development grant to modernize the high-rise apartments in the Central Ward. This program's main thrust was not only to modernize and upgrade the physical structures, but to assist tenants in improving the quality of life as residents of the projects. To accomplish this, the tenants were invited to join with management to participate in suggesting improvements to enhance project services or facilities where needed. A program in excess of \$7,000,000 was developed after many months of tenants meeting with project inspections and conferences. Even prior to formal ratification and amendment to the Annual Contributions Contract, permission was granted from the Housing Assistance Office of the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to complete priority items such as the purchase of refrigerators, installation of new door locks, construction of tamper-proof mailrooms, and the like.

The greatest portion of the development funds will be spent at Kretchmer Homes, N.J. 2-10, Rev. Wm. P. Hayes Homes, N.J. 2-12, Ste. A Windsor Wright Homes, N.J. 2-15, and Edward Scudder Homes, N.J. 2-19. Task forces of maintenance repairmen located at each of the projects are busy eliminating the backlog of repair and replacement work orders. The Community Relations and Social Services Section has been expanding its facilities to provide additional services for families with socio-economic problems to assist them in achieving their maximum potential capabilities in our society. Site improvements at all projects have been planned, including grounds restoration with the possibility of widening walks, repaving and enlarging parking areas, improving and supplementing site lighting, installing or enlarging of play areas, and aesthetic landscaping. In addition to new mailrooms, other major alterations to dwelling structures, such as fluorescent lighting in the public corridors and stairwells, terrazzo floors in the lobbies of public entrances, replacement of hinged elevator doors, installation of closet doors and door peepholes where none exist, are being done. The interiors of the dwellings will be provided with new screens, window shades, new refrigerators with freezing compartments, and new gas ranges where necessary. To provide for better community facilities, additional meeting rooms are being created where space can be converted for Day Care Centers or teenage rooms, and the rehabilitation of existing community facilities is contemplated where space is available. The initial phase of this program will be completed by June 30, 1970.

In the meantime, the Authority has requested the Department of Housing and Urban Development for additional funds to continue the modernization program.

## TENANT SELECTION

People entering public housing usually get the first glimpse of the Newark Housing Authority at the office of Tenant Selection, on the corner of William and Broad Streets. The primary job of the staff of Tenant Selection, is to meet the immediate housing needs of Newark's low-income population. The department concentrates its work on three continuing operations: selection of new tenants for public housing, the eased housing program of the Newark Housing Authority, and membership in the Newark Disaster Coordinating Committee which involves providing immediate aid to disaster victims in Newark.

In 1968 the Tenant Selection Department assisted 2,750 families in securing apartments in public housing of these, 2,314 families, consisting of 5,799 persons, actually moved in. Before entering the projects, 1,333 families resided in substandard dwellings, and another 747 families were or were about to be homeless. The staff worked with each family on an individual basis; a worker ascertained the family's particular needs and location preferences, and then placed the family in appropriately sized apartments. Special assistance was available in emergency cases. In an actual case, a mother and her five children were living in a substandard six-room apartment, the apartment was so far advanced that it confined the family to one room; the floors were rotting, the walls were crumbling, and the ceilings were buckling. They could not even use the bathroom because rats had used it for the nesting place. On the advice of a friend, the distraught mother decided to take action; she applied for admission to public housing. Taking heed of the gravity of her predicament, Tenant Selection located an apartment for her family in one of the housing projects within two days.

Some families are eligible for public housing but prefer private housing. Tenant Selection can assist them by processing their applications and referring them to the Leased Housing Division. Under the Leased Housing Program, the Newark Housing Authority rents private apartments, certified as standard at the market rate. It then subleases these apartments to low-income families at rents within their ability to pay. Federal contributions pay for the difference between the rent which the tenants pay to the Authority and the rent which the Authority pays the landlord.

The Authority is a member, along with other city agencies and charitable organizations, of the Newark Disaster Coordinating Committee, formed in November, 1968. As soon as they are contacted at any time, on any day, the Tenant Selection staff rush to the scene of the disaster to direct the homeless to aid and emergency services. It is the responsibility of the Department of Tenant Selection to house the disaster victims in the housing projects nearest to the disaster area (vacancies permitting); this is usually accomplished within a few hours. The Authority accommodates the families until they find new apartments. Many fire victims found their apartments in the housing projects so appealing that they decided to become permanent residents. In the last three months of 1968, 272 fire victim families, consisting of 1,190 people, chose to remain in NHA projects.

The scope and involvement of the Tenant Selection Department is far greater than mere statistics can indicate. The staff of the department understands the needs, the aims and the hopes of those seeking apartments. And it is this sensitivity to the human problems which makes the Tenant Selection Department an important arm of the Newark Housing Authority.

TABLE I

\*SITE FAMILIES RELOCATED TO: (From Acquired Properties Only)

MARCH 31, 1968 -- MARCH 31, 1969

SITE NO.	Private, Standard Rental Housing		Standard Sales Housing		Public Housing	
	W	N-W	W	N-W	W	N-W
R-6	3	46	0	5	0	41
R-32 (Jan. 1)	0	0	0	0	0	1
R-38	0	0	0	0	0	0
R-45	0	0	0	0	0	0
R-49	0	0	0	0	0	0
R-50	0	0	0	0	0	0
R-52	0	0	0	0	0	0
R-58	1	0	0	0	0	0
R-62	1	1	0	0	0	0
R-72	10	62	2	12	0	18
R-121	4	0	3	0	0	0
R-123	0	0	0	0	0	0
R-141	0	0	0	0	0	0
R-156	0	0	0	0	0	0
R-196 (Sept. 1)	2	85	1	18	0	15
Total	21	194	6	35	0	75

TABLE 1a

\*SITE FAMILIES RELOCATED TO: (From Acquired Properties Only)

MARCH 31, 1968 -- MARCH 31, 1969

SITE NO.	Moved Out of City		Whereabouts Unknown Tracing Efforts Abandoned		Self-Relocated** Substandard Rental Housing		Total
	W	N-W	W	N-W	W	N-W	
R-6	2	6	0	9	0	10	122
R-32	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
R-38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R-45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R-49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R-50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R-52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R-58	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
R-62	0	0	0	0	0	4	6
R-72	3	20	1	4	0	3	135
R-121	12	0	0	0	0	0	19
R-123	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R-141	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R-156	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
R-196	3	19	0	0	0	0	143
Total	20	45	1	13	1	18	429

\*Source: H666 Report (HUD)

\*\*Unsuccessful Efforts to Help family move.

Department of Research, Information &amp; Statistics - 1969

TABLE II

\*SINGLE PERSON FAMILIES RELOCATED TO: (From Acquired Properties Only)

MARCH 31, 1968 -- MARCH 31, 1969

SITE NO.	<u>Public Housing</u>		<u>Private Housing</u>		Total
	W	N-W	W	N-W	
R-6	4	32	7	162	205
R-32	0	2	0	1	3
R-38	0	0	0	0	0
R-45	0	0	0	0	0
R-49	0	0	0	0	0
R-50	0	0	0	0	0
R-52	0	0	0	0	0
R-58	0	1	9	1	11
R-62	0	0	11	3	14
R-72	2	7	19	110	138
R-121	0	0	1	0	1
R-123	0	0	0	0	0
R-141	0	0	0	0	0
R-156	0	0	0	0	0
R-196	1	14	2	149	166
Total	7	56	49	426	538

TABLE III

\*COMMERCIAL ESTABLISHMENTS AND NON-PROFIT INSTITUTIONS  
MOVED FROM RELOCATION SITES (Acquired Properties Only)

MARCH 31, 1968 -- MARCH 31, 1969

SITE NO.	Moved Within City	Moved Outside City	Discontinued Operations	Total
R-6	39	7	73	119
R-32	0	0	1	1
R-38	0	0	0	0
R-45	0	0	0	0
R-49	0	0	0	0
R-50	0	0	0	0
R-52	0	0	0	0
R-58	27	5	17	49
R-62	6	0	9	15
R-72	30	2	21	53
R-121	6	1	1	8
R-123	0	0	0	0
R-141	0	0	0	0
R-156	0	0	0	0
R-196	21	1	44	66
Total	129	16	166	311

TABLE IV

\*RELOCATION SITE ACTIVITIES - (From Acquired Properties Only)  
FAMILIES AND INDIVIDUALS

CUMULATIVE TO MARCH 31, 1969

SITE NO.	Total No.** of Families in Acquired Properties	Total No. of Families Moved to Date	Total No. of Families Moved in 1968-69	Total No. of *** Families Moved to P.H. Since Inception of Site Activities	Total No. of Families Moved to Private, Standard Housing Since Inception of Site Activities
R-6	2,035	1,809	327	337	1,261
R-32	42	4	4	3	1
R-38	305	302	0	36	237
R-45	915	896	0	120	663
R-49	79	79	0	10	60
R-50	85	66	0	2	56
R-52	377	377	0	63	266
R-58	147	142	13	3	138
R-62	557	545	20	41	427
R-72	1,041	978	273	89	763
R-121	35	20	20	0	8
R-123	0	0	0	0	0
R-141	0	0	0	0	0
R-156	56	56	1	7	37
R-196	614	319	309	31	264
Total	6,288	5,593	967	742	4,181

\*Source: H666 Report (HUD)

\*\* Includes single person families.

\*\*\*Families and individuals residing in properties within  
approved site area at time of loan and grant.

Department of Research, Information & Statistics - 1969



TABLE V

\*SITE FAMILIES RELOCATED TO: (From Acquired Properties Only)

CUMULATIVE TO MARCH 31, 1969

SITE NO.	<u>Private, Standard Rental Housing</u>		<u>Standard Sales Housing</u>		<u>Public Housing</u>	
	W	N-W	W	N-W	W	N-W
R-6	26	522	2	66	11	239
R-32	0	0	0	0	0	1
R-38	8	151	2	24	1	33
R-45	65	172	13	17	37	55
R-49	2	22	0	1	1	8
R-50	4	1	2	0	0	0
R-52	12	97	2	18	9	47
R-58	5	2	0	0	1	0
R-62	41	64	5	11	15	12
R-72	38	326	6	57	2	58
R-121	4	0	3	0	0	0
R-123	0	0	0	0	0	0
R-141	0	0	0	0	0	0
R-156	4	6	0	0	3	2
R-196	2	86	1	23	0	16
Total	211	1449	36	217	80	471

\*Source: H666 Report (HUD)

Department of Research, Information &amp; Statistics - 1969

TABLE Va

\*SITE FAMILIES RELOCATED TO: (From Acquired Properties Only)

CUMULATIVE TO MARCH 31, 1969

SITE NO.	<u>Moved Out of City</u>		<u>Whereabouts Unknown Tracing Efforts Abandoned</u>		<u>Self-Relocated Substandard Rental Housing</u>		Total
	W	N-W	W	N-W	W	N-W	
R-6	12	39	2	82	4	72	1,077
R-32	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
R-38	8	15	0	3	0	3	248
R-45	20	22	26	26	3	16	472
R-49	0	0	1	7	0	1	43
R-50	7	0	1	0	0	0	15
R-52	7	21	1	16	0	3	233
R-58	0	0	0	0	0	1	9
R-62	23	11	15	18	1	9	225
R-72	13	85	2	13	0	13	613
R-121	12	0	0	0	0	0	19
R-123	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R-141	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R-156	6	5	0	0	1	0	27
R-196	3	21	0	0	0	0	152
Total	111	219	48	165	9	118	3,134

TABLE VI

\*SINGLE PERSON FAMILIES RELOCATED TO: (From Acquired Properties Only)

CUMULATIVE TO MARCH 31, 1969

SITE NO.	<u>Public Housing</u>		<u>Other Housing</u>		Total
	W	N-W	W	N-W	
R-6	11	76	28	617	732
R-32	0	2	0	1	3
R-38	0	2	6	46	54
R-45	19	9	255	141	424
R-49	0	1	2	33	36
R-50	2	0	49	0	51
R-52	2	5	17	120	144
R-58	0	2	102	29	133
R-62	9	5	121	185	320
R-72	6	23	44	292	365
R-121	0	0	1	0	1
R-123	0	0	0	0	0
R-141	0	0	0	0	0
R-156	2	0	17	10	29
R-196	1	14	2	150	167
Total	52	139	644	1,624	2,459

\*Source: H666 Report (HUD)

Department of Research, Information &amp; Statistics - 1969

TABLE VII

\*COMMERCIAL ESTABLISHMENTS AND NON-PROFIT INSTITUTIONS  
MOVED FROM RELOCATION SITES (Acquired Properties Only)

CUMULATIVE TO MARCH 31, 1969

SITE NO.	Moved Within City	Moved Outside City	Discontinued Operations	Total
R-6	191	25	207	423
R-32	0	0	1	1
R-38	28	1	18	47
R-45	59	20	94	173
R-49	42	8	23	73
R-50	0	4	16	20
R-52	57	13	28	98
R-58	69	20	36	125
R-62	40	7	79	126
R-72	84	11	86	181
R-121	8	1	1	10
R-123	0	0	0	0
R-141	0	0	0	0
R-156	3	1	9	13
R-196	21	1	44	66
Total	602	112	642	1,356

# PUBLIC HOUSING STATISTICS

## TABLE INDEX

Subject	Table No.	Page No.
Highlights		43
Project Locations, Areas, Dates	A	44
Schedule of Apartments	B	45
Schedule of Apartments Designed Exclusively for Elderly Families	C	46
Schedule of Income Limits for Admission and Continued Occupancy	D	47
Schedule of Rents	E	48
Ceiling Rent and Welfare Rent Schedules	F	49
Census of Families and Persons	1	50
Census of Elderly Families	2	51
Census of Broken Families	3	52
Census of Large Families and Small Families	4	53
Census of Families Relocated from Urban Renewal Sites since 1964	5	54
Census of Over-income Families	6	55
Census of Minors	7	56
Distribution of Families by Number of Minors	8	57
Census of Families with Workers	9	58
Census of Families with Wages as the Only Source of Income	10	59
Census of Families Receiving Public Welfare	11	60
Census of Families with Public Welfare as the Only Source of Income	12	61
Census of Families Needing a Larger Apartment	13	62
Census of Families Needing a Smaller Apartment	14	63
Census of Families by Length of Residence	15	64
Distribution of All Families by Gross Annual Income	16A	65
Distribution of Elderly and Non-Elderly Families by Gross Annual Income	16B	66
Distribution of All Families by Rent	17A	67
Distribution of Elderly and Non-Elderly Families by Rent	17B	68
Census of Families Paying Welfare Rents	18	69
Average Monthly Rent (Utilities included) by Apartment Size	19	70
Vacancies — 1968	20	71
Moveouts — 1968	21	72
New Tenants — 1968	22	73
Census of All Families by Number of Persons	23	74
Average Family Sizes	24	75
Distribution of Tenants by Age and Sex	25	76-77
Distribution of All Families by the Age of the Head	26	78
Explanatory Notes		79

# HIGHLIGHTS PUBLIC HOUSING STATISTICAL DATA

## DWELLING UNITS

Currently under management	11,721
Designed exclusively for elderly and disabled families	1,746
Additonal elderly units to come under management by 1970	1,000

## PERSONS

Total	37,683	
Female	21,300	56.5%
Male	16,383	43.5%
Minors	20,562	54.6%
Elderly (aged 62 or over)	4,704	12.5%

## FAMILIES

Total	11,425	
Elderly	4,243	37.1%
Broken	2,921	25.6%
Large (7 or more persons)	1,193	10.4%
Small (1 or 2 persons)	5,638	48.5%
Re-located from U R S tes since 1964	895	7.8%
Over-income	674	5.9%
With 4 or more minors	2,284	20.0%
With workers	5,562	48.7%
With wages as only source of income	4,079	35.7%
Receiving public welfare	3,422	30.0%
With public welfare as only source of income	1,951	17.1%
Paying welfare agency rents	2,458	21.5%
Needing a larger apartment	756	6.6%
Needing a smaller apartment	653	5.7%
Living in the projects 10 years or more	2,093	18.3%

## ELDERLY FAMILIES

With annual income less than \$2,000	1,990	46.9%
With annual income \$2,000-\$2,999	1,347	31.8%
Paying monthly rent (utilities incl.) \$32-\$49	2,616	61.7%
Paying monthly rent (utilities incl.) \$50-\$69	1,190	28.0%
Average family size		1.5 persons

## ALL FAMILIES

With annual income less than \$4,000	6,797	59.5%
Paying monthly rent (utilities incl.) \$32-\$69	6,777	59.3%
Average family size		3.3 persons
Moveouts - 1968	1,442	13.4%
		turnover
New Tenants - 1968	2,280	
Average vacancies (at any given time)	250	2.1%

TABLE A  
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK  
PROJECT LOCATIONS, AREAS, DATES

<u>N.J. PROJECT NAME</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Phone 622-1030 Extensions</u>	<u>City Location</u>	<u>Site Area in Acres</u>	<u>Initial Occupancy</u>
2-1 S. Boyden...	124 Seth Boyden Terrace	434-5	East Ward	15.62	Oct. 1940
2-2 Pennington..	214 South Street	318-9	East Ward	4.55	Feb. 1940
2-5 Baxter.....	202 Orange Street	511-12	Central Ward	12.67	May 1941
2-22B Baxter E....	25 Summit Street	291-2	Central Ward	3.40	Dec. 1967
2-6 S. Crane....	1 Stephen Crane Plaza	513-4	North Ward	14.26	Oct. 1940
2-16 Crane E.....	60 Cedar Lane South	513-4	North Ward	1.99	Nov. 1962
2-22C Crane E.....	900 Franklin Avenue	432-3	North Ward	2.90	Apr. 1968
2-22D Crane E.....	801 No. 6th Street	213-6	North Ward	3.10	June 1968
2-7 Hyatt.....	11 Hawkins Court	300-1	East Ward	9.75	Mar. 1942
2-8 Fuld.....	80 Jelliff Avenue	260	Central Ward	6.73	Dec. 1941
2-9 Roosevelt...	35 Riverview Court	303-4	East Ward	11.55	Nov. 1946
2-10 Kretchmer...	71 Ludlow Street	515-6	East Ward	14.83	May 1953
2-17 Kretchmer E.	35 Van Vechten Street	515-6	East Ward	1.58	Jan. 1962
2-11 Walsh.....	1945 McCarter Highway	316-7	North Ward	14.82	May 1953
2-12 Hayes.....	71 Boyd Street	266-7-8-9	Central Ward	19.15	Jan. 1954
2-18 Hayes E.....	68 Boyd Street	266-7-8-9	Central Ward	0.81	Feb. 1962
2-13 Columbus....	112 Elght Avenue	309-10-11	North Ward	14.60	Oct. 1955
2-14 Bradley.....	46 No. Munn Avenue	306-7	West Ward	9.71	Dec. 1941
2-15 Wright.....	159 Spruce Street	437-8-9	Central Ward	14.13	Dec. 1959
2-19 Scudder.....	165 Court Street	272-3-4	Central Ward	17.60	Dec. 1962
Total.....				194.75	

TABLE B  
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK  
SCHEDULE OF APARTMENTS

N.J. PROJECT NAME	Total	0 Br.	1 Br.	2 Br.	3 Br.	4 Br.	5 Br.	Three Story Bldgs	High-Rise Bldgs
2-1 S. Boyden...	530	--	178	257	95	--	--	12	--
2-2 Pennington..	236	--	87	120	29	--	--	4	--
2-5 Baxter.....	569	--	170	294	105	--	--	21	--
2-22B Baxter E....	250	96	130	24	--	--	--	--	2
2-6 S. Crane....	354	--	136	147	71	--	--	27**	--
2-16 Crane E.....	198	44	132	22	--	--	--	--	2
2-22C Crane E.....	375	151	194	30	--	--	--	--	3
2-22D Crane E.....	375	151	194	30	--	--	--	--	3
2-7 Hyatt.....	402	--	111	186	90	15	--	12	--
2-8 Fuld.....	300	--	72	156	72	--	--	8	--
2-9 Roosevelt...	275	--	100	110	65	--	--	11	--
2-10 Kretchmer...	730	--	80	334	258	56	2	2	5
2-17 Kretchmer E.	198	44	132	22	--	--	--	--	2
2-11 Walsh.....	630	--	75	231	234	78	12	3	9
2-12 Hayes.....	1458	1	191	893	334	29	10	--	10
2-18 Hayes E.....	98	22	65	11	--	--	--	--	1
2-13 Columbus....	1556	--	96	960	384	96	20	--	8
2-14 Bradley.....	301	--	45	181	75	--	--	10	--
2-15 Wright.....	1206	24	120	610	318	82	52	--	7
2-19 Scudder.....	1680	60	294	780	322	154	70	--	8
Total.....	11721	593	2602	5398	2452	510	166	110	60

\*\* Two-story bldgs.



TABLE C  
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK  
SCHEDULE OF APARTMENTS DESIGNED EXCLUSIVELY FOR ELDERLY FAMILIES

<u>CURRENTLY UNDER MANAGEMENT</u>						
<u>Project Number</u>	<u>Total Units</u>	<u>0 Br.</u>	<u>1 Br.</u>	<u>2 Br.</u>	<u>City Location</u>	<u>Initial Occupancy</u>
2-16	198	44	132	22	North Ward	Nov. 1962
2-17	198	44	132	22	East Ward	Jan. 1962
2-18	98	22	65	11	Central Ward	Feb. 1962
2-19	252	60	140	52	Central Ward	Dec. 1962
2-22B	250	96	130	24	Central Ward	Dec. 1967
2-22C	375	151	194	30	North Ward	Apr. 1968
2-22D	375	151	194	30	North Ward	June 1968
Total	1746	568	987	191		

<u>WILL COME UNDER MANAGEMENT IN 1970</u>						
2-21A	440	176	220	44	East Ward	--
2-21E	360	144	180	36	East Ward	--
2-21F	200	80	100	20	East Ward	--
Total	1000	400	500	100		

TABLE D  
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK  
SCHEDULE OF INCOME LIMITS FOR ADMISSION AND CONTINUED OCCUPANCY

CURRENT SCHEDULE

Family Size	ADMISSION LIMITS		CONTINUED OCCUPANCY LIMITS
	Regular	Special*	<u>All Families</u>
1 Person	\$ 4200	\$ 5040	\$ 5300
2 Persons	4800	5760	6000
3 Persons	5300	6360	6625
4 Persons	5700	6840	7125
5 Persons	6000	7200	7500
6 Persons	6300	7560	7875
7+ Persons	6600	7920	8250

SUPERSEDED SCHEDULE

1 Person	3600	4200	4425
2 Persons	4200	4500	5060
3 Persons	4380	4740	5520
4 Persons	4560	4980	5700
5 Persons	4740	5220	5940
6 Persons	4920	5460	6180
7 Persons	5100	5700	6420
8+ Persons	5280	5940	6600

\* These special limits apply to families relocated from Urban Renewal Sites, and to families displaced by fire or natural disaster.

TABLE E  
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK  
SCHEDULE OF RENTS

Formula: \$1 rent per month is charged for each \$55, or fraction thereof, of annual income for rent.  
Income for rent = net income less \$100 for each minor.

Income for Rent	Monthly Rent	Income for Rent	Monthly Rent	Income for Rent	Monthly Rent
\$ 1760	\$ 32	\$ 3575	\$ 65	\$ 5390	\$ 98
1815	33	3630	66	5445	99
1870	34	3685	67	5500	100
1925	35	3740	68	5555	101
1980	36	3795	69	5610	102
2035	37	3850	70	5665	103
2090	38	3905	71	5720	104
2145	39	3960	72	5775	105
2200	40	4015	73	5830	106
2255	41	4070	74	5885	107
2310	42	4125	75	5940	108
2365	43	4180	76	5995	109
2420	44	4235	77	6050	110
2475	45	4290	78	6105	111
2530	46	4345	79	6160	112
2585	47	4400	80	6215	113
2640	48	4455	81	6270	114
2695	49	4510	82	6325	115
2750	50	4565	83	6380	116
2805	51	4620	84	6435	117
2860	52	4675	85	6490	118
2915	53	4730	86	6545	119
2970	54	4785	87	6600	120
3025	55	4840	88	6655	121
3080	56	4895	89	6710	122
3135	57	4950	90	6765	123
3190	58	5005	91	6820	124
3245	59	5060	92	6875	125
3300	60	5115	93	6930	126
3355	61	5170	94	6985	127
3410	62	5225	95	7040	128
3465	63	5280	96	7095	129
3520	64	5335	97	7150	130

Minimum Rent = \$32

TABLE F  
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK  
CEILING RENT AND WELFARE RENT SCHEDULES

Apartment Size	CURRENT CEILING RENT SCHEDULE			SUPERSEDED CEILING RENT SCHEDULE		
	Families		Exceeding Income Limits	Families		Exceeding Income Limits
	Within Income Limits			Within Income Limits		
0 Br.	\$ 98		\$ 108	\$ 88		\$ 98
1 Br.	102		112	92		102
2 Br.	106		116	96		106
3 Br.	110		120	100		110
4 Br.	114		124	104		114
5 Br.	120		130	110		120

Family Size	CURRENT WELFARE RENT SCHEDULE	SUPERSEDED WELFARE RENT SCHEDULE
	Rent	Rent
1 Person	\$ 32	\$ 32
2 Persons	49	37
3 Persons	66	49
4 Persons	83	61
5 Persons	100	73
6 Persons	117	85
7 Persons	130	97
8+ Persons	130	109

TABLE 1  
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK  
CENSUS OF FAMILIES AND PERSONS

N.J. PROJECT NAME	FAMILIES					PERSONS				
	Total	W	N-W	Pct. W	Pct. N-W	Total	W	N-W	Pct. W	Pct. N-W
2-1 S. Boyden...	524	463	61	88.4	11.6	1196	1001	195	83.7	16.3
2-2 Pennington..	236	86	150	36.4	63.6	674	247	427	36.7	63.3
2-5 Baxter.....	564	95	469	16.8	83.2	1668	301	1367	18.0	82.0
2-22B Baxter E....	248	68	180	27.4	72.6	303	83	220	27.4	72.6
2-6 S. Crane....	352	318	34	90.3	9.7	883	778	105	88.1	11.9
2-16 Crane E.....	196	191	5	97.4	2.6	270	261	9	96.7	3.3
2-22C Crane E.....	372	343	29	92.2	7.8	476	442	34	92.9	7.1
2-22D Crane E.....	372	293	79	78.8	21.2	478	371	107	77.6	22.4
2-7 Hyatt.....	394	220	174	55.8	44.2	1291	645	646	50.0	50.0
2-8 Fuld.....	294	15	279	5.1	94.9	875	22	853	2.5	97.5
2-9 Roosevelt...	269	60	209	22.3	77.7	871	228	643	26.2	73.8
2-10 Kretchmer...	700	316	384	45.1	54.9	2699	1132	1567	41.9	58.1
2-17 Kretchmer E.	198	186	12	93.9	6.1	249	232	17	93.2	6.8
2-11 Walsh.....	601	287	314	47.8	52.2	2648	1241	1407	46.9	53.1
2-12 Hayes.....	1444	17	1427	1.2	98.8	5080	32	5048	.6	99.4
2-18 Hayes E.....	95	8	87	8.4	91.6	117	10	107	8.6	91.4
2-13 Columbus....	1465	917	548	62.6	37.4	5766	3521	2245	61.1	38.9
2-14 Bradley.....	301	279	22	92.7	7.3	808	731	77	90.5	9.5
2-15 Wright.....	1148	4	1144	.3	99.7	4984	10	4974	.2	99.8
2-19 Scudder.....	1652	82	1570	5.0	95.0	6347	455	5892	7.2	92.8
Total.....	11425	4248	7177	37.2	62.8	37683	11743	25940	31.2	68.2

TABLE 2  
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK  
CENSUS OF ELDERLY FAMILIES

N.J. PROJECT NAME	BY RACE				BY NUMBER OF PERSONS		
	Total	Pct.	W	N-W	1 Person	2 Persons	3+ Persons
2-1 S. Boyden...	313	59.7	303	10	202	99	12
2-2 Pennington..	86	36.4	34	52	62	14	10
2-5 Baxter.....	193	34.2	38	155	111	64	18
2-22B Baxter E....	246	99.2	67	179	193	51	2
2-8 S. Crane....	145	41.2	137	8	67	59	19
2-16 Crane E.....	195	99.5	190	5	123	70	2
2-22C Crane E.....	371	99.7	342	29	270	98	3
2-22D Crane E.....	369	99.2	293	76	267	99	3
2-7 Hyatt.....	129	32.7	106	23	86	30	13
2-8 Fuld.....	112	38.1	12	100	74	24	14
2-9 Roosevelt...	86	32.0	17	69	63	19	4
2-10 Kretchmer...	178	25.4	129	49	94	58	26
2-17 Kretchmer E.	198	100.0	186	12	147	51	--
2-11 Walsh.....	99	16.5	66	33	64	17	18
2-12 Hayes.....	273	18.9	12	261	138	99	36
2-18 Hayes E.....	93	97.9	8	85	72	21	--
2-13 Columbus....	277	18.9	217	60	158	89	30
2-14 Bradley.....	163	54.2	157	6	75	67	21
2-15 Wright.....	237	20.6	2	235	119	73	45
2-19 Seadder.....	480	29.1	11	469	303	123	54
Total.....	4243	37.1	2327	1916	2688	1225	330
			54.8%	26.7%	63.3%	28.9%	7.8%

TABLE 3  
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK  
CENSUS OF BROKEN FAMILIES

N.J. PROJECT NAME	BY RACE				BY NUMBER OF MINORS			
	Total	Pct.	W	N-W	1 Minor	2 Minors	3 Minors	4+ Minors
2-1 S. Boyden...	52	9.9	32	20	24	12	8	8
2-2 Pennington...	61	25.8	11	50	21	17	11	12
2-5 Baxter.....	124	22.0	23	101	44	37	18	25
2-22B Baxter E....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2-6 S. Crane.....	47	13.3	40	7	32	10	2	3
2-16 Crane E.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2-22C Crane E.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2-22D Crane E.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2-7 Hyatt.....	95	24.1	32	63	30	32	16	17
2-8 Fald.....	88	29.9	1	87	24	32	11	21
2-9 Roosevelt...	61	22.7	9	52	17	19	15	10
2-10 Kretschmer...	199	28.4	51	148	54	52	35	58
2-17 Kretschmer E.	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2-11 Walsh.....	195	32.4	81	114	39	42	38	76
2-12 Hayes.....	584	40.4	1	583	175	167	119	123
2-18 Hayes E.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2-13 Columbus....	500	34.1	238	262	132	136	100	132
2-14 Bradley.....	48	15.9	39	9	22	13	5	8
2-15 Wright.....	359	31.3	--	359	81	101	77	100
2-19 Scudder.....	508	30.7	13	495	131	152	90	135
Total.....	2921	25.6	571	2350	826	822	545	728
			13.4%	32.7%	28.3%	28.1%	18.7%	24.9%

TABLE 4  
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK  
CENSUS OF LARGE FAMILIES AND SMALL FAMILIES

E.J. PROJECT NAME	LARGE FAMILIES (7+ PERSONS)				SMALL FAMILIES (1 - 2 PERSONS)			
	Total	Pct.	W	N-W	Total	Pct.	W	N-W
2-1 S. Boyden...	18	3.4	15	3	379	72.3	350	29
2-2 Fennington..	13	5.5	2	11	121	51.3	37	84
2-5 Baxter.....	28	5.0	7	21	299	53.0	48	251
2-22B Baxter E....	--	--	--	--	246	99.2	68	178
2-6 S. Crane....	10	2.8	7	3	228	64.8	211	17
2-16 Crane E.....	--	--	--	--	194	99.0	189	5
2-22C Crane E.....	--	--	--	--	369	99.2	340	29
2-22D Crane E.....	--	--	--	--	369	99.2	291	78
2-7 Hyatt.....	37	9.4	23	14	178	45.2	127	51
2-8 Fuld.....	19	6.5	--	19	149	50.7	14	135
2-9 Roosevelt...	24	8.9	10	14	128	47.6	21	107
2-10 Kretchmer...	97	13.9	41	56	238	34.0	141	97
2-17 Kretchmer E.	--	--	--	--	198	100.0	186	12
2-11 Walsh.....	125	20.8	57	68	159	26.5	83	76
2-12 Hayes.....	111	7.7	--	111	535	37.0	13	522
2-18 Hayes E.....	--	--	--	--	95	100.0	8	87
2-13 Columbus....	193	13.2	116	77	471	32.2	318	153
2-14 Bradley.....	10	3.3	9	1	188	62.5	179	9
2-15 Wright.....	229	19.9	--	229	329	28.7	2	327
2-19 Scudder.....	279	16.9	34	249	655	39.6	16	639
Total.....	1193	10.4	321	872	5538	48.5	2642	2886
			7.6%	12.1%			62.2%	40.2%



TABLE 5  
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK  
CENSUS OF FAMILIES RELOCATED FROM URBAN RENEWAL SITES SINCE 1964

F.I. PROJECT NAME	CURRENTLY IN OCCUPANCY				RELOCATED DURING THE YEARS				
	Total	Pct.	W	N-W	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968
2-1 S. Boyden...	8	1.5	5	3	5	1	3	3	2
2-2 Pennington..	10	4.2	5	5	--	4	2	5	3
2-5 Baxter.....	31	5.5	5	26	15	6	7	13	4
2-22B Baxter E....	60	24.2	17	43	--	--	--	--	61
2-6 S. Crane....	2	.6	2	--	--	--	1	1	--
2-16 Crane E.....	1	.5	--	1	--	--	--	--	--
2-22C Crane E.....	14	3.8	5	9	--	--	--	--	16
2-22D Crane E.....	24	6.4	7	17	--	--	--	--	13
2-7 Hyatt.....	32	8.1	11	21	10	5	7	12	4
2-8 Fuld.....	22	7.5	--	22	5	5	9	4	6
2-9 Roosevelt...	37	13.7	7	30	9	15	4	9	7
2-10 Kretchmer...	62	8.9	7	55	7	17	22	19	14
2-17 Kretchmer E.	1	.5	1	--	--	--	--	--	1
2-11 Walsh.....	47	7.8	11	36	6	10	9	8	14
2-12 Hayes.....	118	8.2	--	118	30	37	35	35	38
2-18 Hayes E.....	3	3.2	--	3	--	--	3	1	1
2-13 Columbus....	94	6.4	35	59	1	20	20	43	39
2-14 Bradley.....	7	2.3	7	--	--	2	3	2	--
2-15 Wright.....	117	10.2	--	117	27	43	29	31	24
2-19 Scudder.....	205	12.4	16	189	55	65	56	42	56
Total.....	895	7.8	141	754	170	230	210	228	303*

3.3% 10.5%

\*Not included are 11 Relocated Families in Project NJ 2-21A

TABLE 6  
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK  
CENSUS OF OVERINCOME FAMILIES

N.J. PROJECT NAME	BY RACE				BY THE AMOUNT IN EXCESS OF ELIGIBILITY				
	Total	Pct.	W	N-W	\$1 - 99	\$100-499	\$500-999	\$1000-1999	\$2000+
2-1 S. Boyden...	37	7.1	31	6	1	10	5	8	13
2-2 Pennington..	15	6.4	5	10	1	6	2	1	5
2-5 Baxter.....	56	9.9	1	55	3	13	8	11	21
2-22B Baxter E....	3	1.2	1	2	--	1	2	--	--
2-6 S. Crane....	56	15.9	52	4	--	14	7	16	19
2-16 Crane E.....	5	2.6	5	--	1	--	1	2	1
2-22C Crane E.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2-22D Crane E.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2-7 Hyatt.....	21	5.3	10	11	--	4	3	5	9
2-8 Fuld.....	15	5.1	--	15	1	2	3	6	3
2-9 Roosevelt...	15	5.6	3	12	1	1	6	5	2
2-10 Kretchmer...	33	4.7	6	27	--	8	7	7	11
2-17 Kretchmer E.	1	.5	1	--	--	--	--	1	--
2-11 Walsh.....	29	4.8	10	19	2	7	6	9	5
2-12 Hayes.....	111	7.7	--	111	6	25	23	27	30
2-18 Hayes E.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2-13 Columbus....	59	4.0	25	34	3	14	8	18	16
2-14 Bradley.....	53	17.6	51	2	1	13	6	8	25
2-15 Wright.....	90	7.8	--	90	3	22	21	31	13
2-19 Scudder.....	75	4.5	1	74	6	18	14	22	16
Total.....	674	5.9	202	472	29	158	121	177	189
			4.8%	6.6%					

TABLE 7  
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK  
CENSUS OF MINORS

N.J. PROJECT NAME	IN ALL FAMILIES				IN BROKEN FAMILIES			
	Total	Pct. of Total Population	W	N-W	Total	Pct. of Total Population	W	N-W
2-1 S. Boyden...	404	33.8	304	100	104	8.7	61	43
2-2 Pennington...	341	50.6	120	221	145	21.5	26	119
2-3 Baxter.....	774	46.4	158	616	290	17.4	68	222
2-22B Baxter E....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2-6 S. Crane....	309	35.0	259	50	71	8.0	61	10
2-16 Crane E.....	1	.4	1	--	--	--	--	--
2-22C Crane E.....	1	.2	1	--	--	--	--	--
2-22D Crane E.....	1	.2	--	1	--	--	--	--
2-7 Hyatt.....	692	53.6	319	373	217	16.8	74	143
2-8 Fuld.....	444	50.7	4	440	224	25.6	1	223
2-9 Roosevelt...	467	53.6	128	339	151	17.3	23	128
2-10 Kretschmer...	1590	58.9	616	974	547	20.3	148	399
2-17 Kretschmer E.	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2-11 Walsh.....	1711	64.6	778	933	646	24.4	273	373
2-12 Hayes.....	2951	58.1	8	2943	1472	29.0	4	1468
2-18 Hayes E.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2-13 Columbus....	3516	61.0	2071	1445	1384	24.0	672	712
2-14 Bradley.....	322	39.9	278	44	98	12.1	82	16
2-15 Wright.....	3152	63.3	4	3148	1043	20.9	--	1043
2-19 Scudder.....	3886	61.2	306	3580	1403	22.1	36	1367
Total.....	20562	54.6	5355	15207	7795	20.7	1529	6266
			45.6%	58.6%			13.0%	24.2%

TABLE 8  
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK  
DISTRIBUTION OF FAMILIES BY NUMBER OF MINORS

FAMILIES WITH 4+ MINORS

FAMILIES WITH LESS THAN 4 MINORS

N.J. PROJECT NAME

Total	Pct.	W	N-W
42	8.0	34	8
32	13.6	8	24
70	12.4	19	51
--	--	--	--
23	6.5	19	4
--	--	--	--
--	--	--	--
--	--	--	--
74	18.8	38	36
45	15.3	--	45
45	16.7	18	27
184	26.3	73	111
--	--	--	--
216	35.9	101	115
283	19.6	1	282
--	--	--	--
393	26.8	239	154
34	11.3	29	5
384	33.4	--	384
459	27.8	43	416
2284	20.0	622	1662

No Minors	1 Minor	2 Minors	3 Minors
370	40	44	28
101	44	40	19
269	78	83	64
248	--	--	--
209	57	47	16
195	1	--	--
371	1	--	--
371	1	--	--
152	58	61	49
129	46	48	26
112	34	40	38
196	102	123	95
198	--	--	--
121	74	95	95
366	272	294	229
95	--	--	--
339	244	274	215
180	38	24	25
258	145	186	175
534	213	252	194
4814	1448	1611	1268

14.6% 23.2%

42.1% 12.7% 14.1% 11.1%

TABLE 9  
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK  
CENSUS OF FAMILIES WITH WORKERS

A.I. PROJECT NAME	BY RACE				BY NUMBER OF WORKERS		
	Total	Pct.	W	N-W	No Workers	1 Worker	2+ Workers
2-1 S. Boyden...	221	42.2	168	53	303	199	22
2-2 Pennington..	105	44.5	32	73	131	101	4
2-5 Baxter.....	344	61.0	43	301	220	299	45
2-22B Baxter E....	57	23.0	9	48	191	56	1
2-6 S. Crane....	206	58.5	181	25	146	183	23
2-16 Crane E.....	32	16.3	32	--	164	30	2
2-22C Crane E.....	71	19.1	68	3	301	71	--
2-22D Crane E.....	104	28.0	74	30	268	104	--
2-7 Hyatt.....	201	51.0	89	112	193	172	29
2-8 Fuld.....	160	54.4	2	158	134	142	18
2-9 Roosevelt...	140	52.0	35	105	129	133	7
2-10 Kretchmer...	405	57.9	149	256	295	370	35
2-17 Kretchmer E.	18	9.1	18	--	180	18	--
2-11 Walsh.....	336	55.9	136	200	265	298	38
2-12 Hayes.....	799	55.3	4	795	645	715	84
2-18 Hayes E.....	15	15.8	1	14	80	15	--
2-13 Columbus....	704	48.1	423	281	761	666	38
2-14 Bradley.....	149	49.5	130	19	152	115	34
2-15 Wright.....	665	57.9	1	664	483	577	88
2-19 Scudder.....	830	50.2	54	776	822	762	68
Total.....	5562	48.7	1649	3913	5863	5026	536
			38.8%	54.5%	51.3%	44.0%	4.7%

TABLE 10  
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK  
CENSUS OF FAMILIES WITH WAGES AS THE ONLY SOURCE OF INCOME

N.J. PROJECT NAME	BY RACE				BY FAMILY TYPES			
	Total	Pct.	W	N-W	Elderly	Broken	Large	Small
2-1 S. Boyden...	156	29.8	123	33	11	15	16	63
2-2 Pennington..	83	35.2	31	52	7	13	7	27
2-5 Baxter.....	252	44.7	34	218	14	35	21	98
2-22B Baxter E....	14	5.6	2	12	12	--	--	14
2-6 S. Crane....	155	44.0	135	20	5	18	8	79
2-16 Crane E.....	6	3.1	6	--	5	--	--	6
2-22C Crane E.....	17	4.6	17	--	17	--	--	17
2-22D Crane E.....	22	5.9	16	6	21	--	--	22
2-7 Hyatt.....	154	39.1	65	89	3	23	26	32
2-8 Fuld.....	111	37.7	2	109	12	29	10	33
2-9 Roosevelt...	109	40.5	30	79	3	14	15	27
2-10 Kretzhmer...	329	47.0	123	206	8	58	66	62
2-17 Kretzhmer E.	1	.5	1	--	1	--	--	1
2-11 Walsh.....	277	46.1	113	164	5	28	70	43
2-12 Hayes.....	596	41.3	3	593	14	127	67	145
2-18 Hayes E.....	3	3.2	--	3	2	--	--	3
2-13 Columbus....	594	40.5	367	227	13	83	101	109
2-14 Bradley.....	96	31.9	84	12	11	15	7	35
2-15 Wright.....	500	43.5	2	498	5	71	145	63
2-19 Scudder.....	604	76.6	48	556	15	96	164	106
Total.....	4079	35.7	1202	2877	184	625	723	985
			28.3%	40.1%	4.3%	21.4%	60.6%	17.8%

TABLE 11  
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK  
CENSUS OF FAMILIES RECEIVING PUBLIC WELFARE

N.J. PROJECT NAME	BY RACE				BY TYPE OF WELFARE				
	Total	Pct.	W	N-W	QAA	ABC	AB	APTD	OTHER
2-1 S. Boyden...	69	13.2	59	10	36	18	--	9	9
2-2 Pennington..	76	32.2	22	54	16	40	2	8	12
2-5 Baxter.....	118	20.9	34	84	39	64	3	10	5
2-22B Baxter E....	98	39.5	21	77	74	--	2	21	1
2-6 S. Crane....	47	13.4	41	6	11	17	3	12	6
2-16 Crane E.....	10	5.1	9	1	3	--	2	5	--
2-22C Crane E.....	46	12.4	34	12	34	--	2	8	2
2-22D Crane E.....	71	19.1	48	23	54	--	3	11	4
2-7 Hyatt.....	95	24.1	46	49	15	59	1	7	15
2-8 Fuld.....	82	27.9	5	77	26	43	1	6	8
2-9 Roosevelt...	89	33.1	19	70	22	43	--	12	13
2-10 Kretchmer...	167	23.9	69	98	19	120	--	8	23
2-17 Kretchmer E.	13	6.6	12	1	10	--	--	2	1
2-11 Walsh.....	212	35.3	118	94	23	171	--	11	16
2-12 Hayes.....	549	38.0	3	546	77	401	5	46	39
2-18 Hayes E.....	31	32.6	1	30	30	--	--	--	1
2-13 Columbus....	576	39.3	343	233	62	433	4	26	60
2-14 Bradley.....	19	6.3	14	5	5	10	--	1	3
2-15 Wright.....	389	33.9	1	388	68	277	4	27	26
2-19 Scudder.....	665	40.3	21	644	159	429	12	40	50
Total.....	3422	30.0	920	2502	783	2125	44	270	294
			21.7%	34.9%	6.9%	18.6%	.4%	2.4%	2.6%

TABLE 12  
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK  
CENSUS OF FAMILIES WITH PUBLIC WELFARE AS THE ONLY SOURCE OF INCOME

N.J. PROJECT NAME	BY RACE				BY FAMILY TYPES			
	Total	Pct.	W	N-W	Elderly	Broken	Large	Small
2-1 S. Boyden...	23	4.4	23	--	11	6	--	15
2-2 Pennington..	45	19.1	16	29	15	20	2	22
2-5 Baxter.....	59	10.5	24	35	17	33	5	20
2-22B Baxter E....	33	13.3	4	29	33	--	--	33
2-6 S. Crane.....	20	5.7	18	2	6	8	--	16
2-16 Crane E.....	2	1.0	2	--	2	--	--	2
2-22C Crane E.....	12	3.2	4	8	12	--	--	12
2-22D Crane E.....	22	5.9	13	9	22	--	--	22
2-7 Hyatt.....	59	15.0	26	33	4	39	5	14
2-8 Fuld.....	34	11.6	3	31	8	23	2	16
2-9 Roosevelt...	52	19.3	10	42	18	24	6	27
2-10 Kretschmer...	114	16.3	52	62	8	84	15	22
2-17 Kretschmer E.	4	2.0	4	--	4	--	--	4
2-11 Walsh.....	129	21.5	81	48	14	87	24	36
2-12 Hayes.....	328	22.7	1	327	49	242	23	120
2-18 Hayes E.....	8	8.4	--	8	8	--	--	8
2-13 Columbus....	410	28.0	250	160	41	272	54	109
2-14 Bradley.....	7	2.3	5	2	1	3	2	1
2-15 Wright.....	238	20.7	1	237	43	156	33	73
2-19 Scudder.....	352	21.3	16	336	67	215	43	122
Total.....	1951	17.1	553	1398	383	1212	214	694
			13.0%	19.5%	9.0%	41.5%	17.9%	12.6%



TABLE 13  
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK  
CENSUS OF FAMILIES NEEDING A LARGER APARTMENT

N.J. PROJECT NAME	BY RACE				BY NUMBER OF BEDROOMS NEEDED				
	Total	Pct.	W	N-W	2 Br.	3 Br.	4 Br.	5 Br.	6+ Br.
2-1 S. Boyden...	14	2.7	9	5	--	5	9	--	--
2-2 Pennington..	14	5.9	4	10	1	8	3	2	--
2-5 Baxter.....	4	.7	1	3	--	3	1	--	--
2-22B Baxter E....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2-6 S. Crane....	6	1.7	6	--	3	2	--	1	--
2-16 Crane E.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2-22C Crane E.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2-22D Crane E.....	1	.3	1	--	1	--	--	--	--
2-7 Hyatt.....	25	6.3	12	13	3	14	7	1	--
2-8 Fuld.....	22	7.5	--	22	1	14	6	1	--
2-9 Roosevelt...	41	15.2	8	33	3	18	14	6	--
2-10 Kretschmer...	8	1.1	5	3	3	2	3	--	--
2-17 Kretschmer E.	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2-11 Walsh.....	65	10.8	27	38	1	20	29	9	6
2-12 Hayes.....	77	5.3	--	77	1	46	30	--	--
2-18 Hayes E.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2-13 Columbus....	144	9.8	82	62	2	84	39	16	3
2-14 Bradley....	17	5.6	15	2	--	5	11	1	--
2-15 Wright.....	141	12.3	1	140	2	54	65	20	--
2-19 Soudder.....	177	10.7	10	167	2	88	47	28	12
Total.....	756	6.6	181	575	23	363	264	85	21
			4.3%	8.0%					

TABLE 14  
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK  
CENSUS OF FAMILIES NEEDING A SMALLER APARTMENT

N.J. PROJECT NAME	BY RACE				BY NUMBER OF BEDROOMS NEEDED			
	Total	Pct.	W	N-W	1 Br.	2 Br.	3 Br.	4 Br.
2-1 S. Boyden...	73	13.9	70	3	66	7	--	--
2-2 Pennington..	5	2.1	1	4	4	1	--	--
2-5 Baxter.....	27	4.8	4	23	12	15	--	--
2-22B Baxter E....	4	1.6	--	4	4	--	--	--
2-6 S. Crane....	28	8.0	26	2	17	11	--	--
2-16 Crane E.....	1	.5	1	--	1	--	--	--
2-22C Crane E.....	4	1.1	4	--	4	--	--	--
2-22D Crane E.....	1	.3	1	--	1	--	--	--
2-7 Hyatt.....	23	5.8	14	9	13	7	3	--
2-8 Pald.....	27	9.2	5	22	25	2	--	--
2-9 Roosevelt...	4	1.5	--	4	4	--	--	--
2-10 Kretschmer...	50	7.1	39	11	44	6	--	--
2-17 Kretschmer E.	1	.5	1	--	1	--	--	--
2-11 Walsh.....	70	11.6	38	32	39	17	10	4
2-12 Hayes.....	59	4.1	2	57	46	11	1	1
2-18 Hayes E.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2-13 Columbus....	126	8.6	109	17	111	12	3	--
2-14 Bradley.....	56	18.6	55	1	48	8	--	--
2-15 Wright.....	52	4.5	--	52	38	3	9	2
2-19 Saudder.....	42	2.5	2	40	34	5	3	--
Total.....	653	5.7	372	281	512	105	29	7
			8.8%	3.9%				

TABLE 15  
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK  
CENSUS OF FAMILIES BY LENGTH OF RESIDENCE

N.J. PROJECT NAME	Under 2 Yrs.	2-4 Yrs.	5-9 Yrs.	10-14 Yrs.	15-19 Yrs.	20-24 Yrs.	25+ Yrs.	Age of Project
2-1 S. Boyden...	54	135	131	77	49	8	70	29 Yrs.
2-2 Pennington..	44	60	56	32	27	3	14	29 "
2-5 Baxter.....	65	121	158	69	53	17	81	28 "
2-22B Baxter E....	247	1	--	--	--	--	--	1 "
2-6 S. Crane.....	39	55	86	53	62	9	48	29 "
2-18 Crane E.....	19	31	146	--	--	--	--	7 "
2-22C Crane E.....	372	--	--	--	--	--	--	1 "
2-22D Crane E.....	372	--	--	--	--	--	--	1 "
2-7 Hyatt.....	62	99	112	56	48	4	13	27 "
2-8 Fuld.....	35	62	83	35	43	4	32	27 "
2-9 Roosevelt...	42	72	83	51	19	2	--	23 "
2-10 Kretchmer...	120	245	191	65	79	--	--	16 "
2-17 Kretchmer E.	24	39	135	--	--	--	--	7 "
2-11 Walsh.....	139	196	153	54	59	--	--	16 "
2-12 Hayes.....	235	349	411	218	231	--	--	15 "
2-18 Hayes E.....	6	12	66	6	5	--	--	7 "
2-13 Columbus....	417	452	322	271	3	--	--	13 "
2-14 Bradley.....	35	52	92	48	47	7	20	27 "
2-15 Wright.....	117	304	726	1	--	--	--	9 "
2-19 Scudder.....	297	411	944	--	--	--	--	6 "
Total.....	2741	2696	3895	1036	725	54	278	
	24.0%	23.6%	34.1%	9.1%	6.3%	.5%	2.4%	

TABLE 16 A  
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK  
DISTRIBUTION OF ALL FAMILIES BY GROSS ANNUAL INCOME

N.J. PROJECT NAME	Under \$1000	\$1000-1999	\$2000-2999	\$3000-3999	\$4000-4999	\$5000-5999	\$6000-6999	\$7000 +
2-1 S. Boyden...	6	165	108	57	47	53	41	47
2-2 Fennington..	12	75	36	28	25	33	11	16
2-5 Baxter.....	15	125	77	74	68	64	53	88
2-22B Baxter E....	--	93	117	17	14	3	2	2
2-6 S. Crane....	17	68	56	36	48	38	23	66
2-16 Crane E.....	--	39	94	47	8	3	--	5
2-22C Crane E.....	--	34	235	80	18	5	--	--
2-22D Crane E.....	--	58	220	68	18	6	2	--
2-7 Hyatt.....	13	98	70	49	44	46	27	47
2-8 Fuld.....	18	76	43	39	32	29	26	31
2-9 Roosevelt...	16	71	45	22	28	33	17	37
2-10 Kretchmer...	8	138	96	114	126	79	52	87
2-17 Kretchmer E.	--	13	141	37	5	1	--	1
2-11 Walsh.....	14	101	67	90	120	88	47	74
2-12 Hayes.....	33	304	249	196	228	152	110	172
2-18 Hayes E.....	6	65	13	7	2	2	--	--
2-13 Columbus....	44	311	264	233	254	173	78	108
2-14 Bradley.....	4	57	56	42	31	21	15	75
2-15 Wright.....	29	189	171	155	167	156	115	166
2-19 Sauder.....	50	408	253	222	215	201	148	155
Total.....	285	2488	2411	1613	1498	1186	767	1177
	Under \$2000...24.3%		\$2000-3999...35.2%		\$4000-5999...23.5%		\$6000 +...17.0%	

TABLE 16 B  
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK  
DISTRIBUTION OF ELDERLY AND NON-ELDERLY FAMILIES BY GROSS ANNUAL INCOME

N.J. PROJECT NAME	ELDERLY FAMILIES					NON-ELDERLY FAMILIES				
	Under \$2000	\$2000- \$2999	\$3000- \$3999	\$4000- \$4999	\$5000+	Under \$2000	\$2000- \$2999	\$3000- \$3999	\$4000- \$4999	\$5000+
2-1 S. Boyden...	159	94	31	11	18	12	14	26	36	123
2-2 Pennington..	63	11	3	3	6	24	25	25	22	54
2-5 Baxter.....	116	33	19	9	16	24	44	55	59	189
2-22B Baxter E....	93	116	16	14	7	--	1	1	--	--
2-6 S. Crane....	68	37	13	3	24	17	19	23	45	103
2-16 Crane E.....	39	94	46	8	8	--	--	1	--	--
2-22C Crane E.....	34	234	80	18	5	--	1	--	--	--
2-22D Crane E.....	58	219	67	18	7	--	1	1	--	1
2-7 Hyatt.....	83	23	6	8	9	28	47	43	36	111
2-8 Fuld.....	71	17	9	5	10	23	26	30	27	76
2-9 Roosevelt...	66	12	6	2	1	21	33	16	26	86
2-10 Kretschmer...	108	33	16	9	12	38	63	98	117	206
2-17 Kretschmer E.	13	141	37	5	2	--	--	--	--	--
2-11 Walsh.....	69	8	6	7	9	46	59	84	113	200
2-12 Hayes.....	171	54	22	19	6	166	195	174	209	428
2-18 Hayes E.....	71	13	7	--	2	--	--	--	2	--
2-13 Columbus....	200	41	14	11	11	155	223	219	243	348
2-14 Bradley.....	57	47	22	14	24	4	9	20	17	87
2-15 Wright.....	140	42	18	13	24	78	129	137	154	413
2-19 Scudder.....	311	78	35	17	38	147	175	187	198	466
Total.....	1990	1347	473	194	239	783	1064	1140	1304	2891
	46.9%	31.8%	11.1%	4.6%	5.6%	10.9%	14.8%	15.9%	18.2%	40.2%

TABLE 17 A  
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK  
DISTRIBUTION OF ALL FAMILIES BY RENT\*

N.J. PROJECT NAME	\$32-\$39	\$40-\$49	\$50-\$59	\$60-\$69	\$70-\$79	\$80-\$89	\$90-\$99	\$100-\$109	\$110-\$130
2-1 S. Boyden...	187	76	46	33	29	44	34	31	44
2-2 Pennington..	88	25	14	23	21	19	24	10	12
2-5 Saxter.....	144	50	41	57	46	52	38	62	74
2-22B Saxter E....	1	85	135	8	5	8	2	2	2
2-6 S. Crane....	95	39	26	25	32	33	15	24	63
2-16 Crane E.....	--	65	100	13	6	4	3	1	4
2-22C Crane E.....	--	66	245	43	11	6	1	--	--
2-22D Crane E.....	--	89	223	31	22	4	3	--	--
2-7 Hyatt.....	116	48	24	37	37	31	37	22	42
2-8 Fuld.....	102	28	27	27	19	21	14	27	29
2-9 Roosevelt...	90	29	17	23	20	18	12	27	33
2-10 Kretschmer...	153	65	55	88	89	67	46	64	73
2-17 Kretschmer E.	--	96	79	15	3	3	1	--	1
2-11 Walsh.....	114	46	38	74	70	78	53	58	70
2-12 Hayes.....	334	174	76	190	146	142	131	133	118
2-18 Hayes E.....	75	6	7	3	2	--	2	--	--
2-13 Columbus....	346	178	93	202	202	155	113	105	71
2-14 Bradley.....	68	36	33	23	18	16	14	24	69
2-15 Wright.....	215	108	76	143	130	106	107	121	142
2-19 Scudder.....	457	177	105	188	159	148	137	135	146
Total.....	2585	1486	1460	1246	1067	955	787	846	993
	Under \$50....35.6%		\$50-\$69....23.7%		\$70-\$89....17.7%		\$90-\$130....23.0%		

\*New schedule of welfare rents not reflected in this table.

TABLE 17 B  
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK  
DISTRIBUTION OF ELDERLY AND NON-ELDERLY FAMILIES BY RENT

A.I. PROJECT NAME	ELDERLY FAMILIES				NON-ELDERLY FAMILIES			
	\$32-\$49	\$50-\$69	\$70-\$89	\$90-\$130	\$32-\$49	\$50-\$69	\$70-\$89	\$90-\$130
2-1 S. Boyden...	242	44	14	13	21	35	59	96
2-2 Pennington..	73	4	5	4	40	33	35	42
2-5 Baxter.....	142	28	10	13	52	70	88	161
2-22B Baxter E....	85	142	13	6	1	1	--	--
2-6 S. Crane....	99	19	8	19	35	32	57	83
2-16 Crane E.....	65	112	10	8	--	1	--	--
2-22C Crane E.....	65	288	17	1	1	--	--	--
2-22D Crane E.....	89	252	25	3	--	2	1	--
2-7 Hyatt.....	102	10	8	9	62	51	60	92
2-8 Fuld.....	87	8	9	8	43	46	31	62
2-9 Roosevelt...	78	5	2	1	41	35	36	71
2-10 Kretchmer...	139	17	13	9	79	126	143	174
2-17 Kretchmer E.	96	94	6	2	--	--	--	--
2-11 Walsh.....	74	8	8	9	86	104	140	172
2-12 Hayes.....	222	23	22	6	286	243	266	376
2-18 Hayes E.....	81	10	--	2	--	--	2	--
2-13 Columbus....	238	17	12	10	286	278	345	279
2-14 Bradley.....	91	34	13	25	13	22	21	82
2-15 Wright.....	175	25	17	20	148	194	219	350
2-19 Scudder.....	373	50	20	37	261	243	287	381
Total.....	2616	1190	232	205	1455	1516	1790	2421
	61.7%	28.0%	5.9%	4.8%	20.3%	21.1%	24.9%	33.7%

TABLE 18  
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK  
CENSUS OF FAMILIES PAYING WELFARE RENTS

BY RACE

N.J. PROJECT NAME	Total	Pct.	W	N-W
2-1 S. Boyden...	34	6.5	30	4
2-2 Pennington..	56	23.7	18	38
2-5 Saxter.....	71	12.6	25	46
2-22B Baxter E....	97	39.1	21	76
2-6 S. Crane.....	26	7.4	23	3
2-16 Crane E.....	2	1.0	2	--
2-22C Crane E.....	34	9.1	21	13
2-22D Crane E.....	58	15.6	38	20
2-7 Hyatt.....	67	17.0	30	37
2-8 Fuld.....	47	16.0	3	44
2-9 Roosevelt...	59	21.9	11	48
2-10 Kretschmer...	129	18.4	59	70
2-17 Kretschmer E.	13	6.6	12	1
2-11 Walsh.....	158	26.3	98	60
2-12 Hayes.....	397	27.5	1	396
2-18 Hayes E.....	9	9.5	--	9
2-13 Columbus....	461	31.5	271	190
2-14 Bradley.....	9	3.0	6	3
2-15 Wright.....	273	23.8	1	272
2-19 Scudder.....	458	27.7	17	441
Total.....	2458	21.5	687	1771
			16.2%	24.7%

BY FAMILY SIZE

1 Person	2 Persons	3 Persons	4 Persons	5 Persons	6 Persons	7+ Persons
17	6	4	3	3	1	--
15	10	14	8	6	1	2
14	9	15	12	8	7	6
89	8	--	--	--	--	--
11	7	3	2	--	2	1
2	--	--	--	--	--	--
30	4	--	--	--	--	--
54	4	--	--	--	--	--
8	9	18	14	8	5	5
14	10	11	6	1	3	2
21	9	12	9	1	1	6
10	19	24	26	24	11	15
12	1	--	--	--	--	--
18	21	26	26	18	16	33
50	90	92	74	33	30	28
8	1	--	--	--	--	--
42	78	111	78	53	40	59
--	1	2	3	1	--	2
40	43	52	55	33	15	35
86	74	88	67	46	32	65
541	404	472	383	235	164	259
22.0%	16.4%	19.2%	15.6%	9.6%	6.7%	10.5%



TABLE 19  
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK  
AVERAGE MONTHLY RENT (UTILITIES INCLUDED), BY APARTMENT SIZE

<u>N.J. PROJECT NAME</u>	<u>0-1 Br.</u>	<u>2 Br.</u>	<u>3 Br.</u>	<u>4 Br.</u>	<u>5 Br.</u>
2-1 S. Boyden...	\$ 41	\$ 64	\$ 87	\$ --	\$ --
2-2 Pennington..	40	70	84	--	--
2-5 Baxter.....	44	75	93	--	--
2-22B Baxter E....	52	62	--	--	--
2-6 S. Crane....	48	76	96	--	--
2-16 Crane E.....	52	70	--	--	--
2-22C Crane E.....	53	59	--	--	--
2-22D Crane E.....	53	61	--	--	--
2-7 Hyatt.....	39	66	87	100	--
2-8 Fuld.....	40	64	87	--	--
2-9 Roosevelt...	39	69	93	--	--
2-10 Kretchmer...	38	63	82	97	95
2-17 Kretchmer E.	50	61	--	--	--
2-11 Walsh.....	39	65	81	95	104
2-12 Hayes.....	41	65	89	88	103
2-18 Hayes E.....	36	54	--	--	--
2-13 Columbus....	38	59	81	88	103
2-14 Bradley.....	44	66	102	--	--
2-15 Wright.....	39	87	87	96	97
2-19 Scudder.....	38	63	86	94	97
Total.....	\$ 45	\$ 65	\$ 86	\$ 94	\$ 98

TABLE 20  
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK  
VACANCIES - 1968

VACANCIES AT THE END OF EACH OF THE FOLLOWING PERIODS:  
1st Quarter      2nd Quarter      3rd Quarter      4th Quarter  
1968                      1968                      1968                      1968

<u>E.J. PROJECT NAME</u>	<u>DWELLING UNITS</u>	<u>1st Quarter</u> 1968	<u>2nd Quarter</u> 1968	<u>3rd Quarter</u> 1968	<u>4th Quarter</u> 1968
2-1 S. Boyden...	530	6	2	5	4
2-2 Pennington..	236	0	0	0	0
2-5 Baxter.....	569	9	6	7	4
2-22B Baxter E....	*	--	--	--	--
2-6 S. Crane....	354	2	1	3	1
2-16 Crane E.....	198	1	1	6	3
2-22C Crane E.....	*	--	--	--	--
2-22D Crane E.....	*	--	--	--	--
2-7 Hyatt.....	402	5	3	5	4
2-8 Fuld.....	300	3	1	5	2
2-9 Roosevelt...	275	3	1	2	4
2-10 Kretchmer...	730	11	6	12	5
2-17 Kretchmer E.	198	0	0	0	0
2-11 Walsh.....	630	9	8	25	37
2-12 Hayes.....	1458	27	21	33	16
2-18 Hayes E.....	98	1	1	0	2
2-13 Columbus....	1556	105	66	113	126
2-14 Bradley.....	301	0	0	1	0
2-15 Wright.....	1206	22	9	37	35
2-19 Scudder.....	1680	52	36	59	24
Total.....	10721	256	162	313	267

\* The 1,000 units contained in projects 2-22B, 2-22C and 2-22D did not come under management until 1969.

TABLE 21  
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK  
MOVEOUTS - 1968

<u>N.J. PROJECT NAME</u>	<u>Dwelling Units</u>	<u>Moveouts</u>	<u>Turnover Pct.</u>	<u>1st Quarter</u>	<u>2nd Quarter</u>	<u>3rd Quarter</u>	<u>4th Quarter</u>	<u>Known to Have Purchased Homes</u>
2-1 S. Boyden...	530	46	8.7	10	3	18	15	1
2-2 Pennington..	236	31	13.1	7	10	7	7	5
2-5 Baxter.....	569	49	8.6	14	18	11	6	0
2-22B Baxter E....	*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2-6 S. Crane....	354	21	5.9	5	4	7	5	0
2-16 Crane E.....	198	16	8.1	2	3	5	6	0
2-22C Crane E.....	*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2-22D Crane E.....	*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2-7 Hyatt.....	402	51	12.7	13	10	10	18	0
2-8 Fuld.....	300	29	9.7	6	6	12	5	0
2-9 Roosevelt...	275	31	11.3	14	5	4	8	0
2-10 Kretschmer...	730	87	11.9	24	16	25	22	8
2-17 Kretschmer E.	198	22	11.1	10	3	5	4	0
2-11 Walsh.....	630	137	21.7	17	31	43	46	8
2-12 Hayes.....	1458	177	12.1	37	52	47	41	6
2-18 Hayes E.....	98	8	8.2	3	1	1	3	0
2-13 Columbus....	1556	362	23.3	74	68	117	103	0
2-14 Bradley.....	301	26	8.6	3	9	9	5	6
2-15 Wright.....	1206	121	10.0	23	25	48	25	0
2-19 Scudder.....	1680	228	13.6	42	63	70	53	37
Total.....	10721	1442**	13.4	304	327	439	372	71

\* See Table 20.

\*\* This total includes 77 inter-project transfers.

TABLE 22  
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK  
NEW TENANTS - 1968

N.J. PROJECT NAME	BY RACE			BY APARTMENT SIZE				BY AVERAGE RENT	
	Total	W	N-W	0-1 Br.	2 Br.	3 Br.	4-5 Br.	Previous	NHA
2-1 S. Boyden...	40	31	9	10	14	16	0	\$ 94	\$ 68
2-2 Pennington..	28	13	15	12	15	1	0	79	57
2-5 Baxter.....	38	15	23	11	24	3	0	85	57
2-22B Baxter E....	248	69	179	225	23	0	0	67	51
2-6 S. Crane....	16	15	1	7	8	1	0	97	59
2-16 Crane E.....	14	13	1	12	2	0	0	76	55
2-22C Crane E.....	358	328	30	327	31	0	0	78	54
2-22D Crane E.....	284	223	61	263	21	0	0	75	55
2-7 Hyatt.....	42	21	21	17	23	2	0	77	59
2-8 Fuld.....	23	0	23	9	12	2	0	82	59
2-9 Roosevelt...	27	6	21	13	14	0	0	75	47
2-10 Kretchmer...	94	38	56	12	62	19	1	94	62
2-17 Kretchmer E.	18	17	1	18	0	0	0	76	52
2-11 Walsh.....	111	53	58	10	54	40	7	94	67
2-12 Hayes.....	195	2	193	35	110	50	0	78	57
2-18 Hayes E.....	3	0	3	3	0	0	0	37	32
2-13 Columbus....	338	165	173	20	257	49	12	87	63
2-14 Bradley.....	19	18	1	5	13	1	0	91	58
2-15 Wright.....	120	0	120	22	74	20	4	83	61
2-19 Soudder.....	264	7	257	41	172	33	18	84	62
Total.....	2280*	1034	1246	1072	929	237	42	\$ 80	\$ 58

\* This total does not include the 34 tenants in the new project 2-21A.

TABLE 23  
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK  
CENSUS OF ALL FAMILIES BY NUMBER OF PERSONS

<u>N.J. PROJECT NAME</u>	<u>1</u> Person <u>Families</u>	<u>2</u> Person <u>Families</u>	<u>3</u> Person <u>Families</u>	<u>4</u> Person <u>Families</u>	<u>5</u> Person <u>Families</u>	<u>6</u> Person <u>Families</u>	<u>7</u> Person <u>Families</u>	<u>8</u> Person <u>Families</u>	<u>9</u> Person <u>Families</u>	<u>10+</u> Person <u>Families</u>
2-1 S. Boyden...	228	151	38	42	30	17	12	6	--	--
2-2 Pennington...	77	44	42	33	17	10	8	1	--	4
2-5 Baxter.....	148	151	73	70	63	31	15	5	7	1
2-22B Baxter E....	195	51	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2-6 S. Crane....	106	122	42	41	20	11	5	4	--	1
2-18 Crane E.....	124	70	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2-22C Crane E.....	271	98	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2-22D Crane E.....	269	100	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2-7 Hyatt.....	105	73	60	49	42	28	22	8	2	5
2-8 Fuld.....	89	60	49	32	29	16	6	10	2	1
2-9 Roosevelt...	81	47	35	35	30	17	10	6	2	6
2-10 Kretchmer...	113	125	107	112	86	60	48	24	10	15
2-17 Kretchmer E.	147	51	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2-11 Walsh.....	91	68	79	84	84	70	59	32	20	14
2-12 Hayes.....	204	331	262	246	172	118	57	28	17	9
2-18 Hayes E.....	73	22	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2-13 Columbus....	193	278	244	233	183	141	75	54	34	30
2-14 Bradley.....	90	98	36	23	23	21	3	4	2	1
2-15 Wright.....	155	174	164	162	144	120	91	62	32	44
2-19 Scudder.....	354	301	240	186	167	125	99	73	49	58
Total.....	3113	2415	1481	1348	1090	785	510	317	177	189

TABLE 24  
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK  
AVERAGE FAMILY SIZES

<u>N.J. PROJECT NAME</u>	<u>All Families</u>	<u>W</u>	<u>N-W</u>	<u>Elderly</u>	<u>Non-Elderly</u>	<u>Broken</u>
2-1 S. Boyden...	2.3	2.2	3.2	1.4	3.6	3.1
2-2 Pennington..	2.9	2.9	2.8	1.4	3.7	3.4
2-5 Baxter.....	3.0	3.2	2.9	1.6	3.7	3.5
2-22B Baxter E....	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.0	--
2-6 S. Crane....	2.5	2.4	3.1	1.8	3.0	2.6
2-16 Crane E.....	1.4	1.4	1.8	1.4	1.0	--
2-22C Crane E.....	1.3	1.3	1.2	1.3	1.0	--
2-22D Crane E.....	1.3	1.3	1.4	1.3	1.3	--
2-7 Hyatt.....	3.3	2.9	3.7	1.6	4.1	3.4
2-8 Fuld.....	3.0	1.5	3.1	1.6	3.8	3.7
2-9 Roosevelt...	3.2	3.8	3.1	1.3	4.1	3.5
2-10 Kretschmer...	3.9	3.6	4.1	1.8	4.6	3.8
2-17 Kretschmer E.	1.3	1.2	1.4	1.3	--	--
2-11 Walsh.....	4.4	4.3	4.5	1.9	4.9	4.3
2-12 Hayes.....	3.5	1.9	3.5	1.8	3.9	3.6
2-18 Hayes E.....	1.2	1.3	1.2	1.2	1.5	--
2-13 Columbus....	3.9	3.8	4.1	1.6	4.5	3.8
2-14 Bradley.....	2.7	2.6	3.5	1.7	3.8	3.1
2-15 Wright.....	4.3	2.5	4.3	2.0	5.0	4.0
2-19 Scudder.....	3.8	5.5	3.8	1.6	4.7	3.8
Total.....	3.3	2.8	3.6	1.5	4.3	3.7

TABLE 25 (Page 1 of 2)  
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK  
DISTRIBUTION OF TENANTS BY AGE AND SEX

H.J. PROJECT NAME	Under 5		5		6-11		12-15		16-18		19-20		21-29	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
2-1 S. Boyden...	61	59	14	15	68	63	34	38	21	19	7	9	32	61
2-2 Pennington..	62	55	11	6	48	48	29	30	16	21	13	10	33	52
2-5 Baxter.....	77	85	22	31	139	145	79	80	48	47	16	17	63	107
2-22B Baxter E....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2-6 S. Crane....	16	19	7	9	58	54	44	33	26	26	11	7	30	23
2-16 Crane E.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	1	--
2-22C Crane E.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	2	--
2-22D Crane E.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	1
2-7 Hyatt.....	83	90	19	26	136	102	61	77	36	47	15	11	51	90
2-8 Fuld.....	62	52	14	14	71	78	27	36	38	38	13	14	26	56
2-9 Roosevelt...	49	78	14	14	91	84	49	39	27	17	4	9	27	47
2-10 Kretchmer...	217	222	49	39	267	277	141	140	100	92	29	38	118	182
2-17 Kretchmer E.	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
2-11 Walsh.....	261	229	62	43	302	287	171	173	77	71	27	29	89	181
2-12 Hayes.....	407	435	77	78	503	459	290	254	160	176	82	117	178	351
2-18 Hayes E.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2-13 Columbus....	565	534	106	111	653	542	308	316	158	175	56	79	205	413
2-14 Bradley.....	16	17	5	8	35	50	48	43	35	33	14	17	25	17
2-15 Wright.....	360	361	96	109	645	615	294	307	145	146	38	79	136	298
2-19 Scudder.....	521	532	149	137	745	720	355	350	164	174	42	75	195	420
Total.....	2757	2768	645	640	3761	3524	1930	1916	1051	1082	368	512	1212	2300

TABLE 25 (Page 2 of 2)  
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK  
DISTRIBUTION OF TENANTS BY AGE AND SEX

N.J. PROJECT NAME	30-39		40-49		50-59		60-61		62-71		72+		Total	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
2-1 S. Boyden...	48	41	34	62	44	78	11	12	44	118	70	133	488	708
2-2 Fennington...	26	48	11	29	10	28	4	6	11	29	9	29	283	391
2-5 Baxter.....	62	117	50	91	48	95	10	19	43	80	39	58	696	972
2-22B Baxter E....	--	--	5	6	3	16	1	10	51	108	38	65	98	205
2-6 S. Crane....	32	54	43	73	47	97	7	9	24	64	27	43	372	511
2-16 Crane E.....	1	--	--	2	1	7	2	5	19	77	67	87	92	178
2-22C Crane E.....	--	2	1	--	5	17	4	7	76	170	73	118	161	315
2-22D Crane E.....	1	2	7	8	8	25	2	12	90	151	62	108	171	307
2-7 Hyatt.....	52	81	39	59	18	52	4	4	24	47	21	46	559	732
2-8 Fuld.....	25	50	23	56	15	41	8	6	21	57	13	21	356	519
2-9 Roosevelt...	46	66	24	42	17	35	3	13	19	30	12	15	382	489
2-10 Kretschmer...	96	166	70	120	37	73	8	13	33	67	47	58	1212	1487
2-17 Kretschmer E.	--	--	--	--	--	3	--	4	12	57	55	117	67	182
2-11 Walsh.....	102	178	69	110	31	46	6	8	21	33	12	30	1230	1418
2-12 Hayes.....	158	374	113	282	93	165	11	29	62	103	45	78	2179	2901
2-18 Hayes E.....	--	--	1	3	--	1	--	2	10	28	24	48	35	82
2-13 Columbus....	228	371	151	235	74	133	14	23	43	103	67	103	2628	3138
2-14 Bradley.....	13	32	37	57	34	58	4	8	27	63	38	74	331	477
2-15 Wright.....	234	343	122	205	61	110	12	14	41	108	51	54	2235	2749
2-19 Seudder.....	240	403	143	229	81	140	13	34	81	204	79	121	2808	3539
Total.....	1364	2328	943	1669	627	1220	124	238	752	1697	849	1406	16383	21300



TABLE 26  
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK  
DISTRIBUTION OF ALL FAMILIES BY THE AGE OF THE HEAD

N.J. PROJECT NAME	16-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70-79	80-89	90+	Median Age
2-1 S. Boyden...	--	30	52	59	75	102	158	46	2	64
2-2 Pennington..	1	46	53	29	28	36	34	9	--	46
2-5 Baxter.....	--	66	115	94	93	99	76	19	2	50
2-22B Baxter E....	--	--	--	6	11	121	88	21	1	69
2-6 S. Crane.....	--	9	41	71	99	61	53	16	2	55
2-16 Crane E.....	--	--	--	--	6	34	129	27	--	74
2-22C Crane E.....	--	--	--	--	10	161	160	40	1	70
2-22D Crane E.....	--	--	1	5	15	174	141	36	--	69
2-7 Hyatt.....	3	65	82	65	54	55	56	14	--	47
2-8 Fuld.....	3	38	52	54	42	63	34	7	1	49
2-9 Roosevelt...	1	34	73	46	40	43	23	9	--	45
2-10 Kretchmer...	6	141	182	125	80	71	72	23	--	41
2-17 Kretchmer E.	--	--	--	--	2	29	129	38	--	75
2-11 Walsh.....	5	140	183	124	63	41	34	11	--	39
2-12 Hayes.....	24	330	373	269	197	138	90	21	2	39
2-18 Hayes E.....	--	--	--	2	--	23	55	15	--	74
2-13 Columbus....	20	363	413	253	149	121	108	37	1	38
2-14 Bradley.....	--	8	23	59	56	56	81	18	--	60
2-15 Wright.....	9	240	357	210	126	113	79	13	1	36
2-19 Scudder.....	23	370	422	251	159	199	174	50	4	40
Total.....	95	1880	2422	1722	1305	1740	1774	470	17	48

## EXPLANATORY NOTES

- In Table 2, the percentages at the bottom of the page signify that:  
54.8% of the white families are elderly families.  
26.7% of the non-white families are elderly families.
- This pattern is continued throughout wherever race is indicated.
- Table 7 deals with persons rather than families. Therefore, the percentages at the bottom of this page signify that:  
45.6% of the white population are minors.  
58.6% of the non-white population are minors.  
13.0% of the white population are minors in broken families.  
24.2% of the non-white population are minors in broken families.
- Tables 17A, 17B, 19 reflect the welfare rent schedule which was in effect up to March 31, 1969.
- Table 22 (New Tenants) deals with families rather than persons.